DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 241 UD 011 716

AUTHOR	Neyman, Clinton A., Jr.; And Others
TITLE	Evaluation of ESEA Title I Programs for the District of Columbia, Summer 1970. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	George Washington Univ., Washington, D.C. Social Research Group.
SPONS AGENCY	District of Columbia Government, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Dec 70
NOTE	150p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Problems, *Compensatory Education Programs, *Federal Programs, Program Descriptions, *Program Effectiveness, Remedial Mathematics, Remedial Reading, *Summative Evaluation, Summer Programs

ABSTRACT

This is the report of an evaluation to determine whether ESEA Title I programs conducted in the District of Columbia Schools during the Summer of 1970 fulfilled their stated objectives. The effect of these programs on the students and teachers involved was also investigated. For each of the summer programs there is reported a brief description, objectives, implementation, budget, evaluation, and recommendations made by the evaluators. Findings include a list of programs according to the priority of their effectiveness, ranging from those which successfully accomplished objectives to those which did not. Conclusions indicate that: (1) most summer programs were consistent with overall Title I objectives, emphasizing remedial reading and mathematics for Title I students; and, (2) late funding and planning problems hampered the programs. (Author/DM)

ED0 54241

UD

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION OF ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS
for the District of Columbia, Summer 1970

Final Report

Government of the District of Columbia
Contract NS-70551

Clinton A. Neyman, Jr.
Ann M. Riordan
Lilian D. Jokl

December 1970

UD 011716

Education Division
Social Research Group
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C.

EVALUATION OF ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS
for the District of Columbia, Summer 1970

Abstract of Final Report

PURPOSE

The purpose of this research was to find out whether the Title I programs conducted in the District of Columbia Schools during the summer of 1970 fulfilled their stated objectives. The effect of these programs on the students and teachers who were involved in them was also investigated.

The statement of the objectives for the various programs was obtained from the proposals submitted to the Citywide Advisory Committees and by interviews with program staffs.

PROCEDURE

Information was gathered about the 28 different summer programs by means of an Administrator's Questionnaire, special questionnaires, Student Evaluation Forms, rosters, and by direct observation of programs and interviews with program directors and coordinators.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS

For each of the summer Title I programs, there is reported: (1) a brief description of the program; (2) the objectives; (3) implementation -- including the duration; participants; activities of both staff and students; materials, supplies, and equipment; and any personnel and logistical problems; (4) a statement of the budget allocated to the program; (5) an evaluation of the findings, and conclusions based upon available evidence; followed by (6) the recommendations of the evaluators.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

Attached is a list of the summer programs in groups according to the priority of the effectiveness of the program. Priority 1 programs are those which successfully accomplished their objectives, and were well organized, efficient, and reasonable in cost. The programs in Priority 1A were deemed to be slightly more appropriate to the overall Title I summer

program objectives than those in Priority 1B. Priority 2 programs seemed to be successful in meeting objectives, but they served smaller groups of students and teachers, costs appeared high, or in some other way they fell short of expectations. Priority 3 contains those programs which did not function as planned. Programs in the Special Category were not placed on the priority scale mainly because they are year-round programs and are evaluated during the regular school year.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The objectives of most summer Title I programs were consistent with the overall Title I objectives in that they emphasized remedial reading and mathematics skills and directly served Title I students. Many summer programs focused on teacher training in reading and mathematics instruction.

2. The summer months proved to be especially appropriate for teacher training in allowing greater flexibility and experimentation. Enthusiasm and interest were high in many programs.

3. Title I summer programs would have been more effective had funding not been so late and so complicated. Late funding caused difficulties in recruiting staff, obtaining participants, and procuring supplies.

4. The complicated procedure of making arrangements for salaries and supplies definitely lowered morale and was one of the most frequently cited difficulties, as it has been for the past four summers.

5. While a start was made in getting parent and community participation, much more could be done. Greater lead time and more publicity should be used in future planning.

6. Many programs served far fewer students than planned. This appeared to be caused, at least in part, by late funding and inadequate advance publicity.

7. There was competition for attendance of students between Title I programs and other summer programs. Where possible programs should be planned in such a way as not to overlap in time with other programs held at the same center.

PRIORITIES ASSIGNED TO TITLE I PROGRAMS*
Summer 1970

Priority 1A

Contemporary Environmental Laboratory (Model School Division)
Cultural Enrichment (Model School Division)
Developmental Mathematics (Model School Division)
Developmental Reading (Model School Division)
Educational Camping (Urban Service Corps)
Gonzaga Higher Achievement (Secondary)
Mathematics Institute (Elementary)
Mathematics for Underachievers (Elementary)
Program Planning (Secondary)
Staff Development Workshop for Project READ (Elementary)

Priority 1B

Audiovisual Services (Secondary)
Early Morning Physical Fitness (Elementary)
Mini Woodwork and Homemaking (Elementary)
Primary Reading Enrichment (Elementary)
Summer Scholarships (Secondary)
Urban Communications Workshops (Secondary)

Priority 2

Audiovisual Club (Elementary)
Kingsbury Laboratory School (Elementary)
Mathematics Enrichment (Elementary)
Responsive Environments Corporation Model (Elementary)

Priority 3

Computer Experiences (Secondary)
Instructional Television (Model School Division)
Multi-Station Mathematics Laboratories (Secondary)

Special Category

Community Schools (Model School Division)
Dunbar Communications Laboratory (Secondary)
Innovation Team (Model School Division)
Logan Community School (Urban Service Corps)
Pupil Personnel Services
Terrell Community School (Secondary)

*Programs listed in alphabetical order within priority categories.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Abstract A-1

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

I. Purpose of the Research 1

II. Background and Introduction 1

III. Procedure 1

IV. Description of Programs 2

V. Findings and Conclusions 7
  a. Assignment of Priorities 7
  b. Program Discussion 9
  c. Conclusions 14

VI. Recommendations for Future Research and Evaluation 15

Description and Evaluation
of
Individual Title I Summer Programs

Staff Development Workshop for Project READ (Elementary) 19
Primary Reading Enrichment (Elementary) 24
Responsive Environments Corporation Model (Elementary) 27
Kingsbury Laboratory School (Urban League) 30
Developmental Reading (Model School Division) 37
Instructional Television (Model School Division) 42
Cultural Enrichment (Model School Division) 43
Gonzaga Higher Achievement - Reading and Mathematics (Secondary) 46
Dunbar Communications Laboratory (Secondary) 50
Educational Camping (Urban Service Corps) 52
Contemporary Environmental Laboratory (Model School Division) 58
Urban Communications Workshops (Secondary)
  Journalism Workshop 62
  Broadcast Workshop 69

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(Continued)

Page

Mathematics for Underachievers (Elementary) 70
Mathematics Enrichment (Elementary) 73
Mathematics Institute (Elementary) 76
Developmental Mathematics (Model School Division) 79
Multi-Station Mathematics Laboratory (Secondary) 83
Computer Experiences (Secondary) 86
Summer Scholarships (Secondary) 89
    George Washington University Careers in the Arts Workshop 90
    Georgetown College Orientation 92
    Howard University African Languages 95
    St. Albans International Seminar 96
    Smithsonian Studio Summer Art Workshop 98
    Trinity College Summer Middle School 101

Community Schools (Model School Division)

    Shaw Summer Enrichment 104
    Garnet-Patterson Summer Enrichment 108
Logan Community School (Urban Service Corps) 111
Mini Woodwork and Homemaking (Elementary) 114
Terrell Community School (Urban Service Corps) 115
Early Morning Physical Fitness (Elementary) 118
Pupil Personnel Services Teams 121
Program Planning (Secondary) 124
Audiovisual Services 127
Audiovisual Club (Elementary) 130
Innovation Team (Model School Division) 133

Appendix

Guidelines for Consideration of Title I Programs

Forms -- Administrator's Questionnaire
         Project READ Questionnaire
         Urban Journalism Questionnaire

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This evaluation is a joint effort of the staffs of Dr. Mildred P. Cooper, Assistant Superintendent of the Division of Planning, Innovation and Research of the D.C. Public Schools, and the Education Division of the Social Research Group, George Washington University. Particularly helpful were Mrs. Rose Bulow and Miss Cynthia Harrington, who assisted in the data gathering and report writing.

The program directors and coordinators for the Title I summer programs were quite helpful in supplying information and their cooperation is gratefully acknowledged.

The following groups and agencies kindly permitted the use of the pictures used in this report:

Federal Programs Office, D.C. Public Schools
Garnet-Patterson Community School Program
Urban Communications Workshop, American University
Audiovisual Services Program, D.C. Schools
Washington Evening Star Newspaper
Children's Bureau, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

The art work for the covers was performed by Mr. Bernard Blumberg of the American International Printing Company.

EVALUATION OF ESEA TITLE I PROGRAMS
for the District of Columbia, Summer 1970

I. PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The purpose of the research was to evaluate the 1970 summer programs in the District of Columbia schools funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 89-10.

The primary objective of this study was to obtain estimates of change in student performance and behavior which were uniquely related to these programs and services, as well as to determine whether the individual programs were effectively fulfilling their stated objectives and the overall objectives of Title I.

II. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

This evaluation is a continuation of a series of studies made by the Education Research Division, Social Research Group, George Washington University, of ESEA Title I programs in the District of Columbia schools, beginning in the summer of 1966 and continuing for the school years of 1966-67 to the present.

The guidelines used in recommending these programs are attached in Appendix A. Plans for the 28 summer programs as approved by the City-wide Committee were estimated to involve more than 500 classroom teachers, many administrative personnel, and approximately 12,000 target-area students.

The programs were concentrated in five general areas: reading, mathematics, community schools, health, and supportive services. Considerable emphasis was given to workshops for teachers in mathematics and reading.

III. PROCEDURE

Data were obtained about the summer school programs and the students in them, using the following data-gathering instruments:

a. Administrator's Questionnaire -- This questionnaire asked the program administrators to describe the program and its objectives, what students were served, how the staff was trained, and the problems encountered. It also asked for a statement about recommended changes, and attached a checklist of possible Title I program objectives. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

b. Special Questionnaire -- A special questionnaire was developed for teachers who attended the Project READ workshop. Also, a special questionnaire was given to students in the American University Urban Journalism Workshop. Copies of these questionnaires are included in the Appendix.

c. Student Evaluation Form -- This form was first developed for use in the evaluation of ESEA Title I programs for the District of Columbia schools during the year 1966-67. Various revisions have been made of the form but it remains essentially the same. A teacher evaluation using this form has been made annually for every student in a Title I school. Use was made of previous evaluations to help understand the kinds of students involved in the summer programs.

d. Rosters -- Lists were obtained of students who had participated in the various summer programs. This involved visiting the programs to transcribe the names and other available information about the students. These data will be punched on IBM cards and added to the Title I master data bank from previous studies.

e. Observation of Programs -- Members of the staff of the Education Division of the George Washington University and staff members of the Division of Planning, Innovation and Research of the D.C. schools made visits to the various projects to interview the program directors, and to observe the programs in operation. In some instances, research staff consulted with program staff members who were conducting their own evaluations.

IV. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS

The various Title I programs funded either wholly or in part by funds from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are described in the second section of this report using the following format:

a. Description -- This section briefly tells what the program offered.

b. Objectives -- Generally, the objectives stated are those outlined in the budget request for each program, with statements added from the program administrators or teachers.

c. Implementation -- This section includes the time duration of the program, number of schools involved, number and kinds of students, activities of the staff, and student activities in the program. Information is also included on specialized materials, supplies, and equipment, if any, and on personnel and logistical problems, if any, using the following outline:

1) Duration of Program and Number of Schools
2) Participants
3) Activities -- Staff and Students
4) Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment
5) Personnel and Logistical Problems

d. Budget for the Program -- This section shows the number of students in the program, the number of teachers involved in training, and the allocated Title I budget.

In many cases, the allocated Title I budget was not the total operating budget for the program, as additional support was received from other sources, such as Impact Aid, the regular school budget, and/or private funds.

It is unrealistic in many instances to show a cost per pupil in relation to the allocated budget, because the ultimate recipient of the increase in teacher expertise was not the summer school students in the various programs but rather the students with whom the teacher would work during the following school year.

e. Evaluation -- This section includes the procedures for evaluation, the findings, and the conclusions, based on the evidence which was available during the summer operation of the program. In most cases, the research staff making these judgments felt a follow-through of the students' progress during the school year is essential to conclusively determine the effectiveness of a program.

f. Recommendations -- These recommendations come primarily from the remarks of the program administrators and teachers, with additions by the research staff, resulting from observations, interviews, and conferences.

g. List of Summer Programs -- The table which follows shows for each program the name, the part of the school organization under which it operated, the number of students both planned to serve and the number reported as being served, the number of teacher trainees both planned and actual, whether or not parents were participants in the program, and the total allocated budget for each program from Title I funds.

ESEA TITLE I SUMMER PROGRAMS, 1970

*Participation and Budget Allocations

Name of Program	Number of Children		Teacher Trainees		Parent/ Community Partici- ation	Budget Allocation
	Pre- dicted	Ac- tual	Pre- dicted	Ac- tual		
READING						
Project READ (Elementary)	200	204	185	210[a]	No	$42,047
Primary Reading Enrichment (Elementary)	520	125	-	-	Yes	38,300
Responsive Environments Corporation Model (Elem.)	30	15	2	2	No	19,605
Kingsbury Laboratory School (Urban League) (Elem.)	40	19[b]	-	-	No	10,642
Developmental Reading (Model School Division)	320	185	55	67	No	45,850
Instructional Television (Model School Division)	1400	-	8	-	No	10,940
Cultural Enrichment (Model School Division)	700	417	-	-	No	35,000
Gonzaga Higher Achievement-- Reading and Math (Sec.)	27	47[b]	-	-	No	5,578
Dunbar Communications Laboratory (Secondary)	200	-	-	-	No	13,000
Educational Camping (Urban Service Corps) (Elementary)	154	160[b]	-	-	No	25,000
Contemporary Environmental Laboratory (MSD)	130	126	-	-	No	21,330

---

[a] Project READ:
56 teacher aides
110 teacher aides
44 teacher aides, substitute and prospective teachers
210 total

[b] Kingsbury Lab. School: 40 total, 19 of which were Title I students
Gonzaga: 60 total, 47 of which were Title I students
Educational Camping: 339 total, 160 of which were Title I students

* Best information available

ESEA TITLE I SUMMER PROGRAMS, 1970

*Participation and Budget Allocations
(Continued)

Name of Program	Number of Children		Teacher Trainees		Parent/ Community Participation	Budget Allocation
	Predicted	Actual	Predicted	Actual		
Urban Communications Workshops						$ 7,680
Journalism Workshop (Sec.)	[c]	20[b]	-	-	No	
Broadcast Workshop (Sec.)	[c]	20[b]	-	-	No	
MATHEMATICS						
Mathematics for Underachievers (Elementary)	480	180	-	-	No	15,185
Mathematics Enrichment (Elementary)	100	37	-	-	No	7,026
Mathematics Institute (Elementary)	40	22	22	20	No	20,000
Developmental Mathematics (Model School Division)	320	185	30	37	No	25,200
Multi-Station Mathematics Laboratories (Secondary)	200	35	-	-	No	15,000
Computer Experiences (Secondary)	15	3	-	-	No	3,000
SUMMER SCHOLARSHIPS (Secondary)	48	44	-	-	No	12,703
George Washington University Careers in the Arts						
Georgetown College Orientation						
Howard University African Languages						
St. Albans International Seminar						
Smithsonian Studio Summer Art Workshop						
Trinity Summer Middle School						

---

[b] Journalism Workshop: 40 total, 20 of which were Title I students
Broadcast Workshop: 40 total, 20 of which were Title I students

[c] Journalism Workshop: Figure not available
Broadcast Workshop: Figure not available

* Best information available

ESEA TITLE I SUMMER PROGRAMS, 1970

*Participation and Budget Allocations (Continued)

Name of Program	Number of Children		Teacher Trainees		Parent/ Community Participation	Budget Allocation
	Predicted	Actual	Predicted	Actual		
COMMUNITY SCHOOL						
Community Schools (Shaw and Garnet-Patterson) (MSD)	600	523[d]	-	-	No	$30,000
Logan Community School (Urban Service Corps)	890	418	-	-	Yes	5,000
Mini Woodwork and Homemaking (Elementary)	60	35	-	-	No	4,320
Terrell Community School (Secondary)	200	150	-	-	Yes	10,000
HEALTH						
Early Morning Physical Fitness (Elementary)	500	401	-	-	No	39,105
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES						
Pupil Personnel Services Teams	3500	11,868[e]	-	-	No	49,500
Program Planning (Secondary)	-	-	21	25	No	26,876
Audiovisual Services (Secondary)	[c]	35	-	-	No	10,000
Audiovisual Club (Elementary)	30	11	-	-	No	8,610
Innovation Team (Model School Division)	2000	-	-	-	No	30,000

---

[c] Audiovisual Services: Figure not available

[d] Community Schools: Shaw - 53; Garnet-Patterson - 95 academic
375 workshops

[e] Pupil Personnel: 11,868 identified students in caseload of Teams

* Best information available

V. FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings and conclusions in this section of the report are based upon information contained in the individual evaluations of the programs in the second section of this report. In addition, priority ratings have been assigned to each program in the same manner as was done in previous Title I reports.

a. Assignment of Priorities

The various Title I summer programs were assigned to one of three levels of priority, based upon a combination of several factors:

1) Priority 1

Programs in this category successfully accomplished their objectives, and were well organized, efficient, and reasonable in cost. This category has been divided into two parts, with those programs assigned to Priority 1A deemed to be slightly more appropriate to the overall Title I summer objectives than those in Priority 1B.

2) Priority 2

Programs in this category were for the most part successful in meeting their objectives, but served a very small group of Title I students or teachers, the cost per pupil appeared excessive, or in some other way were not as effective as those in Priority 1.

3) Priority 3

Programs in this category seemed to have satisfactory objectives for the Title I summer programs, but for various reasons did not function as planned.

4) Special Category

Programs in this category were not placed in the priority ratings because they function as part of the year-round program and have been evaluated as part of the regular school year programs. They are included in this report primarily to complete the listing and description of the activities under Title I during the summer.

A list of the programs according to the priority rating assigned follows, and a discussion of each program follows the list. There is no significance to the order listed within priority categories.

PRIORITIES ASSIGNED TO TITLE I PROGRAMS*
Summer 1970

Priority 1A

Contemporary Environmental Laboratory (Model School Division)
Cultural Enrichment (Model School Division)
Developmental Mathematics (Model School Division)
Developmental Reading (Model School Division)
Educational Camping (Urban Service Corps)
Gonzaga Higher Achievement (Secondary)
Mathematics Institute (Elementary)
Mathematics for Underachievers (Elementary)
Program Planning (Secondary)
Staff Development Workshop for Project READ (Elementary)

Priority 1B

Audiovisual Services (Secondary)
Early Morning Physical Fitness (Elementary)
Mini Woodwork and Homemaking (Elementary)
Primary Reading Enrichment (Elementary)
Summer Scholarships (Secondary)
Urban Communications Workshops (Secondary)

Priority 2

Audiovisual Club (Elementary)
Kingsbury Laboratory School (Elementary)
Mathematics Enrichment (Elementary)
Responsive Environments Corporation Model (Elementary)

Priority 3

Computer Experiences (Secondary)
Instructional Television (Model School Division)
Multi-Station Mathematics Laboratories (Secondary)

Special Category

Community Schools (Model School Division)
Dunbar Communications Laboratory (Secondary)
Innovation Team (Model School Division)
Logan Community School (Urban Service Corps)
Pupil Personnel Services
Terrell Community School (Secondary)

*Programs listed in alphabetical order within priority categories.

b. Program Discussion

1) Priority 1A

a) Contemporary Environmental Laboratory (Model School Division) -- This was a well-organized program benefiting both teacher and student participants. It developed teaching skills in making the school curriculum more relevant to the Title I students.

b) Cultural Enrichment (Model School Division) -- This program was a concerted effort to enlarge the cultural horizon of students in the Model School Division, particularly in music, art, literature, dance, and drama. Contact was also provided with professionals in these areas.

c) Developmental Mathematics (Model School Division) -- This program trained teachers in mathematics instructional methods. The primary purpose was to enliven interest and to increase understanding and appreciation. The students with whom the teachers practiced their skills also profited by the experience.

d) Developmental Reading (Model School Division) -- This program was geared to train teachers in methods which would enrich reading instruction so that when they went back to their regular school they would serve as faculty reading consultants. This excellently organized program considered many aspects of teaching educationally deprived children how to acquire reading skills.

e) Educational Camping (Urban Service Corps) -- This program combined many aspects of camping and educational experiences designed to make inner-city children more aware of their environment. During the four two-week camping sessions, over 160 fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students, hand-picked as "identified students", lived in the camping area at Camp Round Meadow, Catoctin Mountain Park, Thurmont, Maryland, which is approximately 60 miles north of the District of Columbia near the Pennsylvania border.

f) Gonzaga Higher Achievement - Reading and Mathematics (Secondary) -- Twenty-nine eighth-grade boys and 31 seventh-grade boys, 47 of whom were regularly enrolled in Title I schools, participated in this academic program to prepare these boys for college. This was the fourth year for this program. Activities included athletic and social events as well as academic instruction.

g) Mathematics for Underachievers (Elementary) -- This was a new summer program concentrating in the area of mathematics for 180 students in grades three through six. In addition to individualized math instruction, games, puzzles, and discovery exercises were used to arouse interest. This program was conducted at four centers.

h) Mathematics Institute (Elementary) -- This was a teacher training course for elementary school teachers which gave college credit for attendance and completion. These teachers were to participate in several mathematics laboratories and clinics during the regular school year.

i) Program Planning (Secondary) -- This program was a workshop for staff members from Title I junior and senior high schools who would be most directly involved in planning and implementing Title I activities during the regular school year. As a result of this workshop, a Building Trades Program will be implemented at Stuart and Terrell Junior High Schools and a special reading project at Dunbar High School. A well-organized summer workshop of this type can greatly facilitate the effectiveness of Title I programs in the regular school session.

j) Staff Development Workshop for Project READ -- This program was designed to indoctrimate elementary school teachers in how to use Project READ materials properly in their classrooms as an instructional process. Both teachers and teacher aides attended the program, and over 200 students were used in the practice phase of the program as subjects for the teaching instruction.

2) Priority 1B

a) Audiovisual Services (Secondary) -- This program provided an opportunity for secondary level Title I students to produce audiovisual aids. Students learned to use cameras, tape recorders, and video tape materials. Each student was supplied with a Kodak Instamatic camera and film. Numerous field trips were taken and students took pictures of other summer Title I programs which were used in brochures describing these programs. Students from this program were able to enter the Kodak Teenage Movie Award Contest for 1970. There was a great deal of emphasis placed on reading and vocabulary development, especially terminology peculiar to the audiovisual field.

b) Early Morning Physical Fitness (Elementary) -- This program provided Title I students with diverse physical fitness activities in which to participate during the summer months. A total of 401 boys and girls took part in the sports and exercises provided by this program. They were served a nutritious breakfast as well as being provided with supervised shower facilities. There was some competition from other Title I programs for membership and attendance, however.

c) Mini Woodwork and Homemaking (Elementary) -- This program offered elementary school children an opportunity to learn handicraft skills and provided practical applications for their reading and mathematics.

d) Primary Reading Enrichment (Elementary) -- This was an innovative program which served three purposes: that of involving parents in the education of their children, improving the reading skills of the student participants, and giving teachers the opportunity to work and experiment with new materials for teaching reading. This would have been a better program had more parents been involved.

e) Summer Scholarships (Secondary) -- This program provided scholarships to 48 secondary school students to attend special programs at universities, colleges, and other institutions in the Washington area. These programs included College Orientation at Georgetown University, a Workshop in Careers in the Arts at George Washington University, a seminar in International Affairs at St. Albans, and a Studio Summer Art Workshop at Smithsonian. The programs were expertly staffed and organized, and provided extremely worthwhile experiences for the students from the inner-city.

f) Urban Communications Workshops (Secondary) -- These workshops were conducted at American University. Students in the Journalism Workshop produced two eight-page newspapers and will be on the staff of the citywide newspaper for inner-city schools to be published during the regular school year. Students in the Broadcast Workshop were given training in radio, television, and film making. It is hoped that college scholarships can be arranged for the more talented and interested students.

3) Priority 2

a) Audiovisual Club (Elementary) -- This small program gave students the opportunity to work with and learn about various audiovisual equipment. Participants were taught skills and procedures in producing materials (art, etc.) for school publications, and to prepare displays and exhibits. This program served a total of 11 boys and girls from six Title I schools.

b) Kingsbury Laboratory School (Elementary) -- This was a six-week pilot reading project, conducted at the Laboratory School of the Kingsbury Center, a private ungraded day school in Washington. Nineteen inner-city children with problems in reading participated in the program. Many innovative methods were used in the program. The location of the school at considerable distance from the inner-city created some logistical problems, as did the lack of communication among the sponsors of the program.

c) Mathematics Enrichment (Elementary) -- This three-week program provided 37 fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade students with an opportunity to explore mathematics through games, puzzles, and experiments. The program was designed for students who had potential in mathematics, but teachers found it necessary to teach the basic concepts to many of the students before enrichment aspects could be handled.

d) Responsive Environments Corporation Model (Elementary) -- This was a small preschool reading program which endeavored to promote a positive self-image in children and to develop intellectual skills and patterns of behavior. The program utilized a variety of innovative materials to achieve its goals. A total of 15 preschool children and two teachers participated in the program. Both teachers have subsequently become unavailable for continuing with the program during the regular school year, so the value of their training during the summer has been lost.

4) Priority 3

a) Computer Experiences (Secondary) -- The three students who participated in this program were all placed in summer jobs dealing with data processing and computers. It was believed that this experience would give students with some background in data processing the opportunity of practical application of the things they had learned. Difficulties were encountered in the supervision of these students at their diverse employment sites, particularly as the kind of work they were expected to perform was quite different at each place.

b) Instructional Television (Model School Division) -- This program provided an instructional course for teachers in the use of television as a means of teaching students. Technical difficulties with equipment prevented obtaining meaningful results with this program.

c) Multi-Station Mathematics Laboratories (Secondary) -- This four-week program provided secondary school students with an opportunity to enhance their mathematics skills in a laboratory setting, using such equipment as audiovisual aids, programed texts, math models, and literature. Field trips to various places of interest were also a part of this program. Although the program was originally planned for 200 students, only 67 submitted applications, only 35 enrolled, and only 20 were present on the day the program was visited.

5) Special Category

a) Community Schools (Model School Division) -- The Shaw Summer Enrichment Program offered students from the Shaw community a variety of courses in certain skills and vocations: Commercial Art, Clothing and Textiles, Library Skills, Printing, Metalcraft, and Woodworking. A total of 53 students participated in this program.

A summer component of a year-round open-community school was conducted at Garnet-Patterson Junior High School. The academic program, held in the morning, was open only to Garnet-Patterson students who wished to make up courses they had failed during the regular school year. Small classes and individual attention given to students were very successful. An all-day skills workshop was open to anyone in the community from ages 12 through 21. This workshop had a large enrollment and was well attended. The Garnet-Patterson Community School received favorable newspaper coverage by the Daily News.

b) Dunbar Communications Laboratory (Secondary) -- This was the first communications laboratory to be established in a senior high school. The laboratory was equipped during the summer with reading machines, cassette tape recorders, listen and read tapes, and other specialized equipment, and arrangements and plans were made for its use during the regular school year.

c) Innovation Team (Model School Division) -- The members of the Innovation Team served as the focal point of the Model School Division summer programs. The Team worked in planning, organizing, and implementing the various summer programs. These programs owe much of their success to the enthusiastic support and efforts of the Innovation Team members.

d) Logan Community School (Urban Service Corps) -- This program was a well-organized effort to integrate the school with the community. Various courses and activities were provided for children as well as adults. Students were offered a choice of educational and leisure or fun activities; adult courses included such areas as sewing, cooking, and swimming. Throughout the summer, a number of family field trips involving both parents and children were arranged.

e) Pupil Personnel Services Teams -- These Teams work year-round to assist seriously disadvantaged students in Title I schools. During the summer, staff members followed up the problems of the most severely disadvantaged children, fostered home-school-community relationships, and organized a number of summer activities and programs for children. They were particularly effective in assisting identified students to become involved in summer programs.

f) Terrell Community School (Secondary) -- This program gave students and adults from the Terrell community a number of diverse course offerings to choose from over the summer. The program included instruction in academic, homemaking, and fine arts areas. An especially unique aspect of the Terrell Community School was a program for blind adults.

c. Conclusions

1) The objectives of most of the summer Title I programs, particularly those which have been given a Priority 1 rating, were consistent with overall Title I objectives in that they, for the most part, emphasized remedial reading and mathematics skills and directly served Title I students. Many of the summer programs focused upon teacher training in the areas of reading and mathematics.

2) The summer months have proved to be especially appropriate for teacher training as the teachers did not need to be relieved from their regular classes by substitutes. Also, the absence of daily pressures of school allow for greater flexibility and more experimentation. The enthusiasm and interest demonstrated by both the teacher trainees and the administrative staffs of many of these programs were really outstanding.

3) Title I programs would have been much more effective if the funding had not been so late and the procedures involved in handling the finances so complicated. Late funding caused many unfortunate results. Not only was it difficult to recruit the staff for these uncertain projects, but it was also difficult to make arrangements for obtaining sufficient numbers of participants and for procuring supplies in time to be available when the program opened.

4) The complications of making arrangements for salaries and supplies connected with the summer projects definitely lowered morale and was one of the most frequently cited difficulties, as has been the case for the past four years. Time and time again program administrators and teachers mentioned that they had to purchase necessary supplies with their own money, as the materials ordered hadn't arrived when the program started. Some materials did not arrive until the last week of the program, and some not at all. Whatever the cause of the difficulty, this situation should be remedied. The summer programs are too short to allow for much delay in these matters.

5) While a start was made in getting the participation of parents and other community persons in summer programs, much more could and should be done. Perhaps greater lead time, and continuing publicity during the school year will improve the situation during the next summer.

6) There were some Title I programs which competed with each other for the attendance of the students. This was because many of them overlapped in time. For example, some students attended the Physical Fitness program only on the days their group was going swimming. In some programs, students dropped out for a week or two to do something else.

7) Many programs served far fewer students than planned. This appeared to be caused, at least in part, by late funding and inadequate advance publicity for programs.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH AND EVALUATION

a. In the programs in which teachers and staff were trained, it was not feasible to evaluate the effects of the programs on the students who participated during the summer, so follow-up studies should be made during the regular school year to obtain information about the following:

1) Did the teacher use the information or training obtained during the summer program?

2) Did the teacher have any comments concerning the course content, both as to what was taught that she needed as well as what was taught that she did not need?

3) Did the teacher have any comments concerning the conduct of the training during the summer that would improve subsequent courses?

b. Some of the programs, such as the Summer Scholarships courses, were designed to improve the educational outlook of Title I students. These students, or a sample of them, should be followed up to determine the following types of information:

1) Did the students find the instruction during the summer useful?

2) Did they think that the summer experience made them better students?

3) What did they like most about the course?

4) What would they like to change about the course?

c. As it is becoming increasingly apparent that student performance depends a great deal upon the teacher, particularly in Title I areas, some sort of study should be made as to the most effective ways of making use of the summer months to increase teacher effectiveness. This research should be designed in a way which would answer the following questions:

1) What are the areas of greatest need in teacher training, or re-training?

2) What are the most effective methods of providing this training?

DESCRIPTION AND EVALUATION
OF
INDIVIDUAL TITLE I SUMMER PROGRAMS

		Page
READING	Staff Development Workshop for Project READ (Elementary)	19
	Primary Reading Enrichment (Elementary)	24
	Responsive Environments Corporation Model (Elementary)	27
	Kingsbury Laboratory School (Urban League)	30
	Developmental Reading (Model School Division)	37
	Instructional Television (Model School Division)	42
	Cultural Enrichment (Model School Division)	43
	Gonzaga Higher Achievement--Reading and Mathematics (Secondary)	46
	Dunbar Communications Laboratory (Secondary)	50
	Educational Camping (Urban Service Corps)	52
	Contemporary Environmental Laboratory (Model School Division)	58
	Urban Communications Workshops (Secondary)	
	Journalism Workshop	62
	Broadcast Workshop	69
MATHEMATICS	Mathematics for Underachievers (Elementary)	70
	Mathematics Enrichment (Elementary)	73
	Mathematics Institute (Elementary)	76
	Developmental Mathematics (Model School Division)	79
	Multi-Station Mathematics Laboratory (Secondary)	83
	Computer Experiences (Secondary)	86
SUMMER SCHOLARSHIPS	Summer Scholarships (Secondary)	89
	George Washington University Careers in the Arts Workshop	90
	Georgetown University College Orientation	92
	Howard University African Languages	95
	St. Albans International Seminar	96
	Smithsonian Studio Summer Art Workshop	98
	Trinity College Summer Middle School	101
COMMUNITY SCHOOLS	Community Schools (Model School Division)	
	Shaw Summer Enrichment	104
	Garnet-Patterson Summer Enrichment	108
	Logan Community School (Urban Service Corps)	111
	Mini Woodwork and Homemaking (Elementary)	114
	Terrell Community School (Urban Service Corps)	115
HEALTH	Early Morning Physical Fitness (Elementary)	118
SUPPORTIVE SERVICES	Pupil Personnel Services Teams	121
	Program Planning (Secondary)	124
	Audiovisual Services (Secondary)	127
	Audiovisual Club (Elementary)	130
	Innovation Team (Model School Division)	133

PROJECT READ (Elementary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The Project READ summer program consisted of two phases. The first phase dealt with the training of elementary school teachers, teacher aides, and substitute teachers who attended two-week Project READ workshops. The format of the workshops consisted of whole group presentations, small group discussions, speech therapy, methods of audio-visual utilization, and device construction.

The second phase of the program involved children who had had difficulty mastering the necessary reading skills during the regular school program. These children were given an intensive remedial program in Project READ, under the guidance of twelve teachers who had attended the first workshop session.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To assist teachers, teacher aides, and substitute teachers in understanding and using Project READ materials.
- To raise the reading level of students who were having difficulty in mastering the basic skills.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The teacher training workshops ran consecutively from 22 July through 14 August 1970, and were held at Clark and Ludlow Elementary Schools. The remedial program for students was conducted from 7 July through 31 July, and was held at seven Title I schools.

b. Participants

A total of 204 students participated in the remedial aspect of the program. They were selected by recommendation from the individual school principals.

Adult participants in the program consisted of 210 teachers, teacher aides, and substitute and prospective teachers. A breakdown of the numbers of participants according to workshop sessions were as follows:

22 June - 2 July -- 56 teachers
6 July - 17 July -- 56 teacher aides
20 July - 31 July -- 54 teacher aides
3 August - 14 August -- 44 teacher aides, substitute and prospective teachers

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff consisted of four group leaders, two consultants from the Behavioral Research Laboratory, two creative activities leaders, one coordinator, one staff member from the D.C. Elementary School Office, and two staff members from the Educational Media Center. The staff was chosen and trained by the Project READ coordinator. Preparation consisted of two full days of training sessions, during which the format for the workshops was planned and the points of program emphasis were determined.

2) Student Activities

The 204 student participants took part in an intensive remedial program in reading each day for four weeks, under the guidance of twelve teachers who had participated in the first workshop session.

4. SPECIALIZED MATERIALS, SUPPLIES, AND EQUIPMENT

The materials consisted for the most part of the Sullivan reading materials. Art supplies were also used in the program.

5. PERSONNEL AND LOGISTICAL PROBLEMS

There was a certain amount of difficulty in obtaining the supplies necessary for the program.

The custodial staff posed a problem in that after the principal went on vacation they would not clean the rooms.

6. BUDGET OF THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 204
Number of teachers, teacher aides, and substitute and prospective teachers: 210
Allocated budget: $42,047

7. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The evaluation procedures of this program consisted of:

1) Questionnaires given to a sample of teacher participants upon completion of the workshop session.

2) Observation of the program by the evaluation staff.

3) Procurement of the names of students and teacher participants for the purpose of future analysis to measure the effectiveness of the program. This analysis would consist of:

    a) Comparing the teachers who participated in the summer workshops with those who had not, to ascertain whether a difference in effectiveness in using Project READ exists.

    b) An analysis of the reading test scores of the students who participated in the summer remedial program, for the purpose of establishing the effect of the program.

b. Findings

Questionnaires distributed to a sample of 49 teachers who attended the summer workshop showed the following:

Question 1 asked the teachers to check the year(s) during which they used Project READ, and to indicate the grade levels. For the 1968-69 school year, 92% of the teachers said they used Project READ, while 78% of them used it in the 1969-70 school year. All grades from kindergarten through sixth grade were represented for both years.

In the next question, the teachers were asked whether they had been given any previous training in the use of Project READ, and if so, to specify what type of training it was. The results showed that 47% of the teachers had received some training, while 53% had received no training. Of those teachers who indicated they had received training, 70% specified the training to have been a one-day introductory orientation to Project READ; the other 30% specified that they had attended a two-day workshop.

The third question asked the teachers whether the summer program had been helpful to them, with three options to choose from: No, Somewhat, and Yes. The second part of the question asked them to specify in what way the program had been helpful. The answers almost all in some way expressed the idea that the training had been helpful in providing the teachers with more information and understanding about Project READ and the way it should and can be used. Examples of some of the comments follow:

> "We were given more information on the how and what of the 'READ' program."
>
> "I have learned the theories behind Project READ and I feel that I will be able to put them to practical use in the fall."
>
> "Project READ has finally been introduced properly like it should have been in the beginning. We now know what is involved in the program."
>
> "It indicated ways of teaching the program and inspired me."

Question 4 asked the teachers how the summer program could have been improved. Almost all of the teachers felt that the training should have included more or all of the teachers using Project READ. Some suggested that the workshop could have been longer. A few teachers commented that although the program was extremely useful, it would have been more effective had it been given before they started working with Project READ.

Observation of the Project READ workshop verified the remarks made by the teachers on the questionnaires. The participants were enthusiastic and willing to learn and work. One of the most striking aspects of the program to an observer was the way in which the teachers worked with each other. There was a common group spirit which made for an easy and valuable exchange of experience and ideas; when one teacher had reached a solution to a problem, she shared it with the others, and it was discussed and demonstrated. This seemed to be the actual essence of the success of the program.

c. Conclusions

The summer program has been successful in meeting its objective in assisting teachers to better understand Project READ.

The summer program would have been more effective had this training been given before Project READ was used in the schools.

All teachers of Project READ would have benefited from such a program.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

All teachers of Project READ should receive training such as that presented in the summer workshops, and this training should be given before they begin to teach Project READ.

A follow-up is recommended during the regular school year of those teachers who were in this program, as to their suggestions for changes or additions to the curriculum, in case the project is to be continued.

PRIMARY READING ENRICHMENT PROGRAM (Elementary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was divided into two segments: Primary Reading Enrichment (PREP), and Children and Parents (CAP). The Primary Reading Enrichment Program focused mainly upon the teaching of fundamental reading skills. A variety of instructional materials was used by the teams of teachers and teacher aides who conducted the program. The school library was open and available for use by students and parents.

The major objective of the Children and Parents Program was to help children improve their reading skills, and at the same time help parents do a better job of assisting their children at home with school work. A new group of parents participated in the program each week, observing the lessons and working with individual groups of children. In this way the parents not only familiarized themselves with the methods of teaching reading but with the various materials as well.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To improve the reading skills of the students.
- To involve and educate parents so they could help their children at home.
- To use and experiment with new teaching materials and methods.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program was conducted from 22 June through 31 July 1970, at the following five schools: Blair-Ludlow-Taylor, J. O. Wilson, Lewis, J. F. Cook, and Madison Elementary.

b. Participants

Students who participated in the program were recommended by principals and teachers of Title I schools. A total of 125 children, from pre-kindergarten through fifth grade took part in the program.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff consisted of 13 regular teachers from Title I schools, 5 of whom were primary level teachers and 8 intermediate level teachers. The teachers were selected by application. A one-week workshop session was held for all teachers prior to the beginning of the program.

2) Student Activities

Pupils worked in large groups, in small groups, and in some cases were given individual tutoring. They were given a mid-morning snack of milk and cookies. They had individual access to the school library which was kept open and supervised at all times during the program.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Among the variety of instructional materials used were: SRA, DISTAR, IMA, Project READ, and Bank Street readers, as well as scrap materials and teacher-made materials.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

There were not enough materials for each center to be adequately supplied, so the materials were evenly distributed among the five centers.

More materials geared to the preschool-age child were needed. Teachers had to use their own innovative methods and techniques to include these children.

Parents were allowed to participate for only one week.

Many parents did not show up.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 125
Number of teachers: 13
Allocated budget: $38,300

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The main thrust of the evaluation will take place when the students who were in this summer program re-enter school in September. The following evaluation techniques will then be utilized:

> Reading test scores will be studied and compared with those of students who were not in the program.
>
> Questionnaires will be sent to parents who participated, in order to see whether they are working with their children at home.
>
> Teachers will be asked about the performance of these students and about their contact with parents.

Various observations of the program were made during the summer.

b. Findings

From the observations made, it is clear that parents have been involved and educated concerning the teaching of reading -- whether or not they help their children at home will have to be seen after school opens in the fall.

Although a shortage of materials did exist, new materials and teaching methods were tried out.

Whether or not the reading skills of the students have improved as a result of the summer program will be seen more clearly during the regular school term when their performance can be measured.

c. Conclusions

The program was effective in meeting its goals of involving parents and experimenting with new teaching materials and methods, although the amount of contact with the parents was limited.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Supplies and materials should be distributed on time.

Necessary supplies and materials should be determined before the program begins, and then be furnished as promised.

RESPONSIVE ENVIRONMENTS CORPORATION MODEL (Elementary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The Responsive Environments Corporation Model Program focused on the development of intellectual skills and patterns of behavior that will enable children from low-income families to participate successfully in society. The program used specially designed learning materials and educational technology to achieve its objectives. Children in the REC classrooms were encouraged to work independently, set goals for themselves, and carry projects through to completion. There was a careful balance between structured and non-structured activities, with emphasis on individualized work rather than group instruction.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide individualized instruction through the use of specially designed learning materials and educational technology.
- To promote a positive self-image for the child through the design of a learning environment in which he experiences success at his own pace.
- To emphasize the early development of competence in the cognitive areas of reading, language arts, and mathematics.
- To encourage the child to work independently, select his own activities, and to become increasingly more responsible for his own behavior.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

This program was conducted at Ludlow Elementary School for approximately six weeks. It was divided into two segments - one for staff training and the other for student participation.

b. Participants

The program was designed for four-year-olds and served 15 students, all from the Title I area. Nine of these will continue in the fall program.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

Since the program was highly individualizdd and encouraged each child to plan and initiate his own activities, the teacher's role differed substantially from that of the traditional teacher. A major function of the teacher was to assess and respond to each child's needs. Careful observation of each child guided the teacher in selecting and organizing appropriate materials and activities. Teachers were provided with training in the use of special materials and educational technology. On-site consultation was provided through REC throughout the program.

2) Student Activities

Each day students received some group instruction with specially designed learning materials; then they were encouraged to plan and initiate their own activities using the various learning materials used in the group instruction. Students were encouraged to explore all of the available materials.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

The materials used were provided by the Responsive Environments Corporation Model, and included the following:

- The Talking Page for Reading Readiness and Beginning Readers
- REC Early Number Multi-group Laboratory
- Water Table
- A selection of special REC learning books and materials

e) Personnel and Logistical Problems

Since a great deal of the money spent for this program is for learning materials, a regular school year program should be conducted in addition to the summer program, in order to obtain a favorable picture budgetwise.

The staff trained during the summer should be used for the fall REC program.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 15
Budget allocation: $19,605

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

Evaluation was conducted through observation of the program and consultation with the program coordinator from the Responsive Environments Corporation in New Jersey.

b. Findings and Conclusions

Students seemed to be making profitable use of the specially designed learning materials provided in this program. A follow-up study should be conducted of the students involved to get the full effect of this program.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Since most of the cost of this program was for materials and staff training, it is recommended that the materials and staff be utilized for an REC program during the regular school year in order that a favorable cost return may be realized for the funds expended.

KINGSBURY LABORATORY SCHOOL (Urban League)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

A six-week pilot reading project was conducted at the Laboratory School of the Kingsbury Center, a private ungraded day school in northwest Washington, which operates on the premise that all children without serious physical handicaps are capable of learning, despite severe learning disabilities. The summer program attempted to demonstrate that children with difficult reading problems are capable of dramatic improvement in a new setting which replicates environments familiar to the child.

Nineteen inner-city children participated in the program, along with 21 children from the Laboratory School, with Title I funds from the D.C. Public Schools providing financial support to the program for the inner-city children. The program was coordinated by the Washington Urban League with the Kingsbury Lab. School and the Center City Community Corporation.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide maximum opportunities for success and pleasure in learning situations.
- To stimulate potential abilities and interests.
- To strengthen academic skills.
- To enhance perceptual development and sharpen the senses.
- To increase vocabulary, information, and organization of thought, with efforts to improve speech and school performance.
- To promote creative problem-solving.
- To spur inquiry.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

This program was conducted from 2 June to 24 July 1970 at the Kingsbury Laboratory School.

b. Participants

The program involved 40 students of average or above average intelligence but who had learning disorders. There were 21 students from the Lab. School and 19 from Simmons Elementary School (a Title I school in the inner-city) ranging from the first through the fourth grades. The 14 boys and 5 girls from Simmons Elementary were selected from names submitted to the Urban League Coordinator by the principal of Simmons and the Pupil Personnel workers assigned to that school.

Students were selected for the program if they had any of the following problems: a minimum of two years behind in reading skills; some type of perceptual problem - visual, auditory, motor, or some combination of these; and difficulties in letter recognition and time-space concepts.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The summer session utilized the following staff, all of whom were partially supported by Title I funds:

Administrative/Professional:

Program designer, coordinator, and administrator of Lab. School
Summer school administrator
Administrative assistant

Professional:

Supervisor-diagnostician-evaluator
Consultant for Sports Clinic
Tutors (6, one acting as supervisor of the group)
Club leaders (4)
Science teacher
Assistants to science teacher (2)

Interns:

Art Workshop (3)
Sports Clinic (3)
Anchor people (4 aides)
Teacher aide (Title I teenager)
Volunteers (several who assisted in the program)

Three days of orientation and workshop sessions helped to prepare the staff for the six-week program. Included were informal lectures, open discussions, prepared instructional materials, dramatic role-playing, and "brain-storming" sessions.

The supervisor-diagnostician and the administrator of the Lab. School trained the staff and worked on a consultant basis. The summer program administrator was in charge of the day-to-day programs. The group of tutors included four Lab. School staff members and two D.C. school teachers trained in Special Education. A teacher from the Innovation Team of the D.C. Schools Model School Division taught the experimental science course, assisted by a specialist in "sound and light" technology. Eleven college students, seven of whom had had previous experience in the Lab. School approach, taught in the summer program. Four students served as "anchors" to each of the four groups of students, their duties including monitoring the structured lunch period and serving as aides to teachers in clubs. A Sports Clinic was run by the college students.

The Roswell-Chall Diagnostic Reading Test of Word Analysis Skills was used for all students; the Gates Advanced Primary Reading Test was also given to the younger students and the Metropolitan Achievement Test was given to the older students. Only the Roswell-Chall Test was used for post-testing, as it has been found that little change can be noted with the other tests in such a short period of time.

In addition to these standardized tests, each child, at the beginning of the program, was asked to complete a numbered drawing with missing parts, and to write such things as the alphabet, numbers, and selected calendar information. Perceptual, conceptual, and motor difficulties were noted, and a "prescription" was written for each child to indicate the type of learning experiences which were to be provided in the tutoring sessions to correct observed difficulties.

2) Student Activities

Transportation was provided for the Title I children to and from the school. The daily program began at 9 a.m. and ended at 2 p.m. A mid-morning snack was provided; regular students brought bag lunches, while Simmons students were provided hot lunches through the D.C. Schools' lunch program.

There were four 45-minute periods before lunch: Tutoring; Sound, Light, and Nature; Woodworking and Art; and Sports Clinic. After lunch, students spent 45 minutes in club activities. All activities, including the clubs, were imaginatively structured to produce specific academic and/or social experiences.

a) Tutoring -- Student-teacher ratios were 2:1 or 1:1. Attention in these sessions was devoted to "prescribed" activities using materials such as games and workbooks to overcome the diagnosed conceptual, perceptual, and motor disabilities and remedial needs of each child.

b) Sound, Light, and Nature -- Scientific experiences were enhanced by student use of sound and camera equipment, and nature explorations; small animals were cared for; field trips were made to nearby fields to collect specimens; movies were viewed and discussed; sounds were identified and recorded. All students participated in the effects of black light by painting designs on themselves and the wall of one classroom with fluorescent paint and viewing the results under ultraviolet light.

c) Woodworking and Art -- All children made and painted chairs and tables which they took home. The emphasis was on the process and not the product, although items were sturdily constructed. Students drew plans, measured materials, cut, and hammered, receiving assistance where necessary. Measurement, spatial relationships, and following directions received academic attention. In art, children sculped. glazed, and baked their own products, as well as drew and painted. Development of the imagination and improvement of small and gross motor skills were incorporated in both classes.

d) Sports Clinic -- The major emphasis of this phase of the program was on muscular coordination, and included the use of drama and music.

e) Club Activities -- Four groups were formed according to age and needs. All activities were structured to develop certain academic skills, including reading and arithmetic, set in a play atmosphere that would appeal to each age and ability level; role-playing was a fundamental part of activities to involve students more actively in learning experiences without "academic" identification. These four groups were known as:

Storekeepers - youngest children; emphasis on arithmetic processes, organization, and classification.

Pirates - geography and reading skills.

Keystone Cops - civics, reasoning, and analytical skills.

Secret Agents - language, through use of codes.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Facilities and equipment of the Lab. School were available and utilized throughout the summer period.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

Transportation for the Title I students was a constant problem throughout the summer session. Public School bus service was not available after the second week, necessitating other arrangements for these students.

The lunch situation for the Title I students was another problem. For one week, the Title I coordinator and the teacher aide were pressed into service to make sandwiches for the 19 children from Simmons Elementary School. Eventually, arrangements were made with the food service department of Francis Junior High School to provide lunches for the Title I students.

The registration and testing of the Title I children also posed problems. There were no records accompanying them from Simmons, and information concerning age, birthday, school grade, etc., had to be obtained from the pupils. (Subsequently, the Title I coordinator made family and school contacts for confirmation.) Since school records were unavailable, more testing was necessary to screen the children.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 19 (Title I)
Allocated budget: $10,642

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

1) Observation of program, and conferences with director.
2) Administrative and director reports.
3) Development of a plan for follow-through study of students during the regular school year.

b. Findings

In every class observed, students were enthusiastically involved in the activity in progress. Students had more freedom than would be permitted in a regular classroom, yet they seemed to exercise self-control with only an occasional reminder from the teacher or student intern present. Except for the tutoring sessions, which were individually conducted by Lab. School-trained teachers, each class had one or two student interns in addition to the teacher.

The director of the program felt that the most obvious improvement was in the social and learning attitudes of some of the students -- less aggressive or withdrawn and more inquisitive and spontaneous. The greatest difficulty was with the older boys, who needed more active physical activity than was possible in the limited quarters, and who also were inclined to disregard the minimal rules in the permissive school setting. However, she emphasized that even these difficulties were manageable.

Parental cooperation was very good; students were ready to leave at 8:15 a.m. from Simmons Elementary School to be bused to the Lab. School. Parents, as a result of the enthusiasm and change of attitude in their children, expressed an interest in continuing such a program, and the Urban League is investigating the possibility. The coordinator kept parents informed about school activities and invited them to an open house during the closing week of school.

A six-week period is usually not sufficient time to obtain measurable achievement test gains. An evaluation of the effectiveness of this summer program will require that a follow-through study be made of children in the program to determine whether or not their attitudes and/or academic achievement level (particularly in reading) improved as a result of the summer program. This study should include:

1) Interviews with the teachers of the students during the 1970-71 school year.
2) Comparison of teacher evaluations of these students as made in May 1969 and May 1970 (Student Evaluation Forms).
3) Comparison of test scores on achievement tests for 1969-70 and 1970-71.
4) Securing previous and current evaluations for these students as made by the Pupil Personnel Services Teams.

c. Conclusions

Many of the logistical problems, which reduced the effectiveness of this program, could have been alleviated by better communication between the Kingsbury Lab. School administration and the District of Columbia School representatives.

In spite of the logistical problems, it was the consensus of staff members, children, and parents that the program was a success. It was felt that new interests were tapped, that the children found learning pleasurable, and that all of the children had some measure of success academically.

A follow-through study during the 1970-71 school year of the Title I students who participated in the summer program will be necessary to determine what changes in attitude and/or academic achievement occurred as a result of this summer program.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

A precise, written agreement should be established and understood among the sponsor, the Lab. School administration, and the D.C. Schools representatives.

There should be earlier recruitment for the Title I students in order to assure compliance with the goals of the remedial program.

Background information records on the summer school students should be made available to alleviate problems in registration and testing.

Details essential to the administration of the school program, such as transportation and lunches, should be carefully worked out before the summer session opens. Periodic follow-ups should be made to insure consistent services.

DEVELOPMENTAL READING (Model School Division)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The reading component of the Model School Division summer program was geared to both students and teachers. Teachers were given training in the teaching of reading, methods, materials, and leadership. Students were provided with the opportunity to advance their reading achievement by intensive instruction during the summer.

2. OBJECTIVES

The main objective of the program was to train teacher representatives from each Model School Division school in the teaching of reading so they could function as Faculty Reading Consultants in their individual schools. Although the objectives listed below pertain directly to students, they involve teachers as well; for example, the first objective, "To extend and enrich reading instruction through developing basic reading skills," refers to students, but the objective also included teaching teachers to do these things. All of the objectives listed should be interpreted in a similar manner.

- To extend and enrich reading instruction through developing basic reading skills.
- To raise the reading levels of students through exploration of new, and revision of traditional, teaching methods and techniques.
- To involve each child in a diagnostic process that will point up his strengths and weaknesses so that he may receive appropriate help and enhance his areas of strengths.
- To choose materials appropriate to the children's instructional levels and to utilize these materials to develop a program designed to suit the individual needs or abilities of each child.
- To utilize a language-based program stimulating children to hear themselves and others, to see their "talk" in print, to regard themselves as authors, and to appreciate the authorship of others.

- To make the classroom situation flexible enough to foster certain attitudinal changes within the child.

- To utilize Polaroid cameras and other media to help create in children the desire to communicate their thoughts to others.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The six-week program started on 22 June and continued through 31 July. The center for most of the activities was at Seaton Elementary School.

b. Participants

Students in this program represented all levels of the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools in the Model School Division. There was no special means of selection of participants; those who desired to participate were accepted.

A total of 67 teachers participated in this component. These teachers were selected on the basis of ballots given to all the teachers in each school. Each member of the faculty was asked to choose three teachers from the school on a first, second, and third choice basis who would be best qualified to be trained to serve as the Faculty Reading Consultant for that school. They were asked to consider such qualities as: human relations skills, group dynamics, broad reading background, knowledge of human resources, ability to work with other teachers, administrators, the community, and children, and successful classroom teacher experience in reading.

The teachers started two weeks before the children arrived. During this time the teachers took part in daily training sessions covering many aspects in the teaching of reading. Each day ended with an evaluation of that day's events. Many consultants who were specialists in particular areas of reading were brought into the daily training sessions. The training sessions were continued after the children arrived, with the difference that part of the day was devoted to carrying out in practice the different learning principles that had been covered.

c. Activities

1. Staff Activities

The staff consisted of a coordinator and a number of consultants in different areas of reading. The consultants worked with the teacher participants, using both lecture and demonstration methods.

2) Student Activities

The students took part in a large variety of learning experiences. Many teaching methods and materials were used and experimented with. In addition, students were given a daily checklist whereby they evaluated the classes they attended.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

There was a vast array of materials, supplies, and equipment, obtained, for the most part, by the Innovation Team of the Model School Division. Among those observed were: different series of reading books, record players, records, games, polaroid cameras, drawing and art supplies, bulletin boards, and many other materials to enhance the teaching of reading.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

One of the main problems encountered was that of paying the teachers. When salary checks were late in arriving, morale suffered.

There was not enough money allotted for supplies. The Innovation Team helped to solve the problem by providing supplies with their own funds.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students:	185
Number of teachers:	67
Allocated budget:	$45,850

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The Innovation Team of the Model School Division conducted its own comprehensive evaluation of the program. It consisted, for the most part, of a series of questionnaires and forms filled out by students, teachers, administrators, and consultants. A list of the forms used follows (next page).

The results of these questionnaires and forms are being compiled by the Innovation Team and a separate report of the results will be put out.

Name of Form	Who Completed It
Background Information	Teachers
Participant Interview	Teachers
Participant Involvement	Teachers, Administrators
Observation Form	Teachers, Students
Evaluation of Consultant Performance	Consultants, Administrators
Documentarian's Feedback	Administrators
Open Classroom Interview	Teachers
Student Information	Students
Student Interview	Students
Secondary Student Daily Checklist	Students
Elementary Student Daily Checklist	Students
My Summer Teacher	Students
Staff Questionnaire	Students

Frequent unscheduled visits were made by the staff of George Washington University to this activity for observation.

Program administrators and teachers were interviewed.

A follow-up study of both teachers and students will be conducted during the 1970-71 school year. It is believed that the effects of the summer program can best be evaluated by observing the subsequent performance of the students and teachers who took part in the program. Rosters of the teacher and student participants have been obtained so that follow-up can be done.

b. Findings

1. New materials and methods were experimented with.
2. The enthusiasm of all the participants -- teachers, students, and administrators -- was extremely high.
3. According to teachers' comments on their evaluations, the consultants brought in were quite effective.
4. According to checklist evaluations filled in by the students, they found to program to be both useful and enjoyable.

c. Conclusions

From the observations made by the evaluation team and the questionnaires filled out by the participants, the program appears to have been successful in meeting its objectives. One of the main intangible factors which contributed to the success of the program was the overwhelming enthusiasm which was immediately evident to anyone who observed the program.

It must be noted that the final evaluation of the effectiveness of this program lies in the amount of the carry-over on the part of both the teachers and the students into their regular school and classroom situations. The amount of change can be determined only through some sort of follow-up study.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The teachers who took part in the program were asked to make their recommendations, among which were:

- More materials should be made available.
- More released time should be given teachers for in-service training in reading.
- There should be follow-up support from the Innovation Team.
- There should be more workshops for the slow learner.
- There should be more sharing between schools.
- Follow-up should be conducted of the teacher participants in the program to determine whether the program actually did help them in teaching reading and in directing others.
- Follow-up should be conducted of the student participants in the program to determine which teaching methods and materials were the most effective, and how reading skills have been improved.
- Better estimates should be made of materials and supplies needed in the program so that it would not be handicapped by lack of materials.
- Adequate liaison should be maintained with the appropriate fiscal office to insure prompt payment of salaries.

INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION (Model School Division)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was designed to train teachers in how to use instructional television, focusing on both the humanistic and technological aspects.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To identify the expertise within the group (to know each other's capabilities)
- To evaluate each individual's performance.
- To define roles within the group.
- To address the group on the mechanics of an organizational structure at school level and team level.
- To raise the level of productivity.
- To raise the level of trust so that members of the group can be more objective.
- To relate more on a human interaction level - listening, sharing, respecting, and cooperating with one another.
- To define tasks according to interests.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

Unfortunately, throughout the summer weeks there were a number of technical difficulties which deterred the functioning of the program as planned.

4. BUDGET OF THE PROGRAM

Allocated budget: $10,940

5. EVALUATION

Due to the difficulties mentioned above, it was not possible to evaluate the program with any validity.

CULTURAL ENRICHMENT (Model School Division)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The summer Cultural Enrichment Program of the Model School Division, an extension of the winter program, was a continuation of work in the visual and performing arts. Students and teachers both were provided the opportunity to explore and develop new areas in the fine arts. The program was flexible enough to allow for the fulfillment of aesthetic, academic, physical, and emotional needs of the students.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide a center in which an atmosphere can be created that will motivate and stimulate training in the arts.
- To integrate the arts with reading and mathematics along with the other content subjects of the curriculum.
- To meet the expressed needs of the students of the Title I schools in the Model School Division and the community.
- To develop an appreciation through participation in the arts: music, art, literature, dance, drama, and others.
- To design a cultural arts program that is meaningful and relevant to the development of the total child.
- To expose students to professional artists and performers.
- To discover and develop young artists at the elementary and secondary levels.
- To provide an outlet for students' emotional needs.
- To foster team work and interdependency.
- To provide a strong foundation for students interested in the arts as a major or career.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program started on 22 June and continued through 14 August. Students from sixteen elementary and secondary schools were represented. The main center of activities was Cardozo High School.

b. Participants

There were 182 boys and 235 girls (total, 417) in this program, most of whom were from Title I schools.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff consisted of teachers from the D.C. School System in the various art areas. In addition, the program included paraprofessionals and youth aides.

For one week before the program started, the staff took part in an orientation and planning session. During this time, the staff participated in such things as: defining goals and objectives; planning the instructional program; devising class schedules; acquiring instructional materials, supplies, and equipment; creating attractive classroom settings; and becoming acquainted with the responsibilities of the staff.

2) Student Activities

Students took part in the visual or performing art activity in which they were most interested. Most of the participants were continuing work in areas that had been started during the winter. The course offerings included: drama, elementary instrumental music, elementary vocal music, gymnastics, modern dance, secondary instrumental music, secondary vocal music, and visual arts.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Musical instruments, dance costumes, art supplies, sheet music, and records were used in this program.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

Extensive planning prior to the beginning of the program was not possible because funding was not assured enough in advance.

Supplies and materials were late in arriving, thus making it difficult to begin the program.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 417
Allocated budget: $35,000

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The evaluation design of this program consisted of observation of the program by the evaluation staff, and administering a questionnaire to the program director.

b. Findings

The students in this program learned to play various musical instruments with an adequate degree of mastery; they mastered various dance techniques; and they developed painting, drawing, and arts and crafts skills.

c. Conclusions

Although it is difficult to measure a cultural enrichment program in objective terms, it is believed that this summer program was successful in meeting its objectives.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that this program be continued again next summer.

GONZAGA HIGHER ACHIEVEMENT - READING AND MATHEMATICS (Secondary)

1. DESCRIPTION

This program offered an all-day academic and enrichment experience, with some evening activities, for sixty junior high school boys with good potential but average achievement. The program sought to improve achievement and motivation, and to encourage these boys to prepare for college.

The program was held at Gonzaga College High School, a private Catholic Jesuit school noted for its high scholastic standards. This program has been held continuously since the summer of 1965, and is a prime example of the cooperation between the public and parochial school systems.

2. OBJECTIVES

To offer academic and enrichment experiences for junior high school boys with good potential but only average achievement who may not otherwise be guided toward higher academic achievement.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

This program was conducted from 29 June through 7 August. Students from Garnet Patterson, Hamilton, Langley, Shaw, Stuart, and Terrell Junior High Schools, and from Holy Redeemer, St. Paul and St. Augustine, St. Martin's, and Gonzaga Pre-Prep Catholic parochial schools attended the program.

b. Participants

There were 29 eighth-grade boys and 31 seventh-grade boys enrolled in the program. Of these, 47 attended Title I schools during the regular school year.

The faculty of Gonzaga College High School contacted the guidance counselors in the D.C. public and parochial schools in May to explain the objectives of the program. Counselors were asked to recommend students for the program who were underachievers and lacked home support.

A follow-up program is planned for the regular school year so that the boys will not retrogress. Tutorial sessions by the Gonzaga staff will be held each Saturday morning.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

An important feature of this program was the ratio of staff to students: there was a director, seven teachers, and four tutors, which made the ratio one staff member to every five students.

The director had a background in junior and senior high school education, teaching the disadvantaged, and curriculum development in math, science, and social work. Five teachers were Jesuits with backgrounds in teaching, three of them having previously taught in Higher Achievement Programs. There were two teachers from the public schools with experience in teaching the disadvantaged, and four of the tutors had had previous association with the Higher Achievement Programs.

Teachers' meetings were held weekly to discuss any difficulties and to exchange ideas.

2) Student Activities

All students were required to take math, composition, literature, reading, and speech. After classes, afternoon educational trips were taken to places of interest; students were free to go on these trips or to remain in school and play games or engage in sports. In the evenings, basketball games were played or trips taken to culturally entertaining events such as the Carter Barron Amphitheater.

Lunches were provided by the public school system.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Science Research Associates programmed reading materials were used for the reading classes. Tape recorders were used in the speech classes.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

Recruiting for students was conducted too late in the school year (May). At that time the guidance counselors in the schools are too busy to devote the amount of time needed for this type of recruiting.

The 29 boys in the eighth grade were divided into two sections so that one group could take a more advanced math class. The result was that the problem boys were isolated in the other class and teachers had a disciplinary problem.

Many students chose to remain at the school for sports rather than attend the cultural events.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 60 (47 from Title I schools)
Allocated budget: $5,578

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

1) Conference with director and staff regarding implementation of the program.
2) Observation of the program.
3) Administrator's Questionnaire.
4) List of boys participating, for possible follow-up into regular school year.

b. Findings

1) The program was well planned and administered.
2) The boys seemed to value this experience and there was very little absenteeism.
3) Nineteen of the group were able to meet the scholastic standards for admission to the Gonzaga Pre-Prep Program in the fall school term and were awarded scholarships to this school.

c. Conclusions

For the majority of the boys, the program seemed to be successful in improving reading and mathematics skills, improving speech and language abilities, improving attitude toward school, and extending the boys' cultural horizons.

A follow-through study in the regular school term should be made to determine the progress of the students who attended the summer program.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Recruitment of students should be started as early as February. After receiving recommendations from the guidance counselors in the schools, Gonzaga staff should interview and visit the students, to make certain that the students chosen are those who do not have the ordinary sources of motivation.

Recruitment of teachers should be started earlier, and Black teachers should be sought for the staff.

It should be made clear to the students from the beginning of the program that cultural trips are an integral part of the program and that they are expected to attend them.

Speech courses should be restructured into a language course.

The seventh and eighth grades should be divided into three subsections each. This would increase the teaching hours but would provide a more effective teaching climate.

Staff meetings should be held in advance of the program, to discuss the advisability of having a full-time counselor on the staff, and the incorporation of a physical education program.

DUNBAR COMMUNICATIONS LABORATORY (Secondary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

A Communications Laboratory, consisting of reading machines, cassette tape recorders, listen and read tapes, and other specialized equipment, was equipped during the summer, and arrangements and plans made for its use during the regular school. This Laboratory will provide a resource center for students in need of special assistance in any of the communications skills -- listening, speaking, reading, or writing.

2. OBJECTIVES

The objective of the summer program was to set up and equip the Communications Laboratory, for use during the regular school year.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

As there was no regular schedule involved, there was no starting or ending date for this program. Dunbar High School was the only school involved.

b. Participants

A staff member of the Dunbar High School was assigned to secure the equipment for the Laboratory.

c. Activities

There were no regularly assigned activities or students.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Equipment for this Laboratory is similar to that being used in similar communications laboratories in various junior high schools in the city, and includes:

Reading machine
Cassette recorders and listen-read tapes
Contemporary Communication Kits published by Science Research Associates

This is the first communications laboratory to be established in a senior high school.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

None

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Allocated budget: $13,000

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

- An interview was conducted with the project director, and a visit was made to the Laboratory.
- An interview of the students who use the Laboratory during the regular school year will be required to determine the effects of this program on the students.

b. Findings

No findings are possible as to the effectiveness of this program at the present time.

c. Conclusions

The program for the Laboratory appears to be consistent with the objectives set forth above.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The program should be re-evaluated after the Laboratory has had an oppo- tunity to work with Title I students during the regular academic year.

EDUCATIONAL CAMPING (Urban Service Corps) (Elementary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

A summer educational camping program was held for elementary school children of the District of Columbia at Camp Round Meadow, Catoctin National Park, Thurmont, Maryland, approximately 60 miles north of the District. The program was funded in part by Title I funds, with matching support from the United States Department of the Interior through the Office of the Superintendent of the Catoctin National Park, the Office of the District of Columbia Summer in the Parks Program, and the Office of the Director of the NEED Program (National Environmental Education Department).

The program was divided into four camping periods, with two weeks of resident camping for each child.

The major thrust of the academic component of the program involved remedial reading and the use of materials from Project NEED, which are designed to provide educational experiences in environment awareness, appreciation, and understanding.

It was hoped that the summer educational camping program would provide a prototype for future development of a year-round educational program for the D.C. Public School System.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To extend the awareness of urban youth beyond the city environment into a natural environment, and acquaint the students with the natural beauty and historical resources of the Catoctin Park area.
- To provide specialized training in reading skills.
- To provide an opportunity to develop physical skills.
- To provide recreational experience available in an outdoor camp setting.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

There were four camping sessions of two weeks each, conducted from 28 June through 21 August, at Camp Round Meadow, Catoctin National Park, Thurmont, Maryland.

Campers were selected from the entire Title I elementary school population.

b. Participants

A total of 339 children attended this program. Of this number, 160 were "identified" students from Title I schools. The Title I campers were selected by the Pupil Personnel Services Department of the D.C. Public Schools, who obtained clothing and other personal supplies for the children through the Urban Service Corps, as well as making arrangements for medical examinations and transportation.

The campers, as to grade and sex, were as follows:

	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Total
Boys	65	58	59	182
Girls	50	52	55	157
	115	110	114	339

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The Department of the Interior provided the following staff members:

1	Camp director
1	Assistant camp director
1	Arts and crafts director
1	Recreation director
1	Camp nurse

The D.C. schools portion of the staff consisted of:

1	Curriculum director
4	Educational specialists
1	Pupil Personnel Worker
6	Counselors

Staff training was achieved through a week of orientation and workshop held at Round Meadow Camp the week prior to the beginning of the first session of camp. The educational specialists were qualified classroom teachers in the D.C. Public Schools, and the program was directed by a reading specialist.

2) Student Activities

Each child spent three hours each day under instruction by an educational specialist in academic subjects. The remainder of the day was spent in physical development, camping and recreational activities, such as trips to Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, a trout hatchery, a fire tower, a charcoal furnace, a still, a farm, and other well-known park landmarks; nature and stream hikes; fishing; hayrides; overnight camping; cookouts; swimming; organized games; arts and crafts; singing; dance; talent shows; and campfires.

Arrangements were made and transportation provided for the parents of the campers to visit the camp for one day during each two-week camping session.

Campers returned to their homes on Friday of the first week of each camping session and returned to camp on Sunday to begin the second week of the camping period.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

We Are Black, published by Science Research Associates, was used as the reading material to develop basic remedial skills, because:

- Reading selections are based on the lives of Black people with whom students can identify, thus enhancing their own self-image.
- Individualized reading is stressed.
- Vocabulary and comprehension skills based on selections help develop critical thinking.
- Student self-evaluation is provided through training in using key booklets.
- Reading selections serve as springboards for further creative activities.

In utilizing materials from Project NEED, opportunity was provided for educational experiences in environment awareness, appreciation, and understanding. The permanent facilities of a national park and the surrounding area offered an ideal setting for the development of an environmental philosophy relating human resources to natural resources.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

- Late arrival of supplies and equipment hindered the effectiveness of the program.
- There was insufficient staff to relieve staff members who were ill or required emergency leave.
- There were complaints from both staff and campers about the food -- it was felt that the meals were not well balanced and that the quantity was inadequate.
- Some youngsters arrived with old injuries requiring treatment which the insurance policy did not cover. Some parents sent children who were on medication without the medicine.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 339 (160 Title I)
Allocated budget: $25,000

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

1) Visit to campsite -- conference with director and staff; observation of academic instruction and camping activities; tape recorder interviews with sample of campers.

2) Administrator Questionnaire

3) Counselor Questionnaire

b. Findings

Interviews with the sample of campers indicated that this was the first camping experience for the majority of them and that they were enjoying the experience. The children said they particularly enjoyed swimming and arts and crafts.

The particular group interviewed did not express any opposition to the academic classroom work at camp. When asked a specific question as to whether they felt they had difficulty in school in reading, most of them said they had and they felt the summer work in reading at camp would help them next year in school.

There were few complaints expressed by the campers and no suggestions for changing the camp. The children said "they liked it as it was."

The staff also did not indicate any major problems in the camp operation. However, they all expressed the fact that many of the children at the beginning of the camp period did resist the idea of going to academic classes, but after some encouragement by the staff seemed to enjoy the classes and liked the reading material about famous Black people.

For some children, the SRA reading materials were too difficult and other approaches to reading had to be used with these children.

Several of the staff felt a three-week camping period would be more beneficial for the children, and that the longer period would enable more thorough work in the reading instruction and the use of the NEED materials. The majority of the staff felt the food service was inadequate, both in quality and quantity.

Almost without exception, the staff felt a personal challenge in working with inner-city children in a camp setting.

c. Conclusions

The staff felt the objective of extending the awareness of urban youth beyond the city environment into a natural environment had been accomplished. At the same time, the children were able to benefit from specialized training in the development of reading and related academic subjects.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Order supplies and equipment far enough in advance so they will be available prior to the opening of camp.
- Increase the quality and quantity of food.
- Make certain that the children know prior to coming to camp that they will attend classes daily in reading and other academic subjects.
- Place the responsibility of teaching ecology through the use of the NEED materials with the staff of the Department of Interior. Their familiarity with the area and special field trip sites gives them a more favorable

position to develop understanding of the basic needs. What have been merely field trips to places of interest could become dynamic teaching situations calculated to increase the city child's aesthetic educational appreciation of nature.

- Write job descriptions for staff positions to make certain each person knows exactly what is expected of him.

- Investigate the feasibility of using the camp facilities of the national park on a year-round basis to develop an educational camping program for children of the District of Columbia during the school year.

- This program should be given high priority for continuation next summer as well as throughout the regular school year.

CONTEMPORARY ENVIRONMENTAL LABORATORY (Model School Division)

Summer, 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The Contemporary Environmental Laboratory was divided into three areas of learning: Science, Black History, and Man: A Course of Study. The underlying premise of the program was to teach these subjects in a manner that was real and relevant to the students.

2. OBJECTIVES

It should be noted that the objectives listed below, although referring directly to students, were meant to be applied to teachers as well, in that one of the overall objectives of the program was to train teachers in how to accomplish these objectives.

- To understand the likeness and difference between man and other animals.
- To look at things true for all men.
- To provide open-ended experiences.
- To use community resources to enrich the curriculum.
- To include other cultural materials besides those covered by the curriculum.
- To understand psychosexual stages of development.
- To develop skills in handling behavioral problems of Blacks, and to increase the development of insight through ego supportive techniques and permissive authority.
- To expose learners to environmental science by using the classroom, playground, neighborhood, home, and community.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program started on 22 June and continued through 31 July. All schools in the Model School Division took part in the program.

b. Participants

Students in this program were from the Model School Division. There was no special method used to select the students -- those who chose to participate were accepted.

Teachers in the program were required to work closely with coordinators, directors, and consultants in planning an effective program. They were asked to attend in-service workshops, and to develop "mini-units" for future teaching experiences.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

Each coordinator was responsible for his own laboratory. He was expected to keep a daily log, which was at intervals shared with other coordinators as a "Major Laboratory." In addition, he was expected to assist in developing methods and techniques for a continuum of learning, as well as to aid consultants with in-service training.

2) Student Activities

Students took part in a great many first-hand learning experiences. They had live animals brought in to study, grew plants, and were given the experience of seeing and handling many unique inanimate objects; they built an African hut out of mud in the schoolyard at Garrison Elementary School. In addition, speakers with experience or expertise in specific areas came to talk to the students; one was an ex-drug addict who very candidly discussed his past.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Among the specialized materials, supplies, and equipment observed were:

Live birds, cats, reptiles, etc.
Cages for birds and other live animals, insects, etc.
Science materials, such as various kinds of rocks.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

Morale was affected by the fact that salary checks were late in being issued.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Allocated budget: $21,330

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The Innovation Team of the Model School Division conducted its own in-depth evaluation of this program. It consisted for the most part of a series of questionnaires and forms given to the students, teachers, administrators, and consultants. A list of the forms used follows:

Name of Form	Who Completed It
Participant Involvement	Teachers, Administrators
Observation Form	Teachers, Students
Evaluation of Consultant Performance	Consultants, Administrators
Documentarian's Feedback	Administrators
Open Classroom Interview	Teachers
Student Information	Students
Student Interview	Students
Secondary Student Daily Checklist	Students
Elementary Student Daily Checklist	Students
My Summer Teacher	Students
Staff Questionnaire	Students

A separate report of the results of these questionnaires will be put out.

- A number of random observations were conducted at frequent intervals by the staff of George Washington University.
- Interviews of program administrators and teachers were conducted.
- A follow-up study of both teachers and students will be conducted during the 1970-71 school year. It is believed that the effects of the summer program can best be evaluated by the resulting performance and attitudes of the students and teachers who took part in the program.

b. Findings

- New materials and methods of teaching mathematics were experimented with and tried out.
- The program showed evidence of detailed planning and organization.
- Teachers benefited from the experience of one another.

- The enthusiasm of all participants (teachers, students, and administrators) was extremely high.
- According to teacher evaluations, the consultants were effective and useful.

c. Conclusions

From the observations made by the evaluation team and the questionnaires filled out by the participants, the program seems to have been successful in meeting its objectives. All participants were very enthusiastic about the program.

It must be noted that the final evaluation of the effectiveness of this program will lie in the amount of carry-over of both teacher and student participants into their regular school and classroom situations. The amount of this change can be determined only through some sort of follow-up study.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The teachers who took part in the program were asked to make recommendations, which included:

- More materials should be available.
- More released time should be given teachers for in-service training.
- There should be follow-up support from the Innovation Team.
- There should be more workshops for the slow learner.
- There should be more sharing between schools.

In addition, the following recommendations are also offered:

- Follow-up should be conducted of the teacher participants in the program to determine whether the program actually did help them in teaching Science, Black History, and Man: A Course of Study.
- Follow-up should be conducted of the student participants to determine which teaching methods and materials were most effective, and how they have improved in the areas studied.
- Better estimates should be made of materials and supplies needed in the program so that it will not be handicapped by lack of teaching materials.
- Adequate liaison should be maintained with the appropriate fiscal office to insure payment of salaries on time.

URBAN COMMUNICATIONS WORKSHOPS (Secondary)

Journalism Workshop
Broadcast Workshop

Summer 1970

Urban Journalism Workshop

1. DESCRIPTION

The Urban Journalism Workshop at American University was a four-week course in basic journalism. Unlike formal traditional classes, the workshop required a maximum of participation by the students, since two eight-page tabloid newspapers were published by the students in the four-week period of the summer program.

Students planned the newspapers from their inception to the time they were completed. They chose the name of the newspaper, selected the page editors, and played a major role in determining the contents of the publications. Stories were written by the students from interviews they conducted and from research developed in pursuit of story material.

Students were grouped in sections of 9-11 students each, under the direction of a student advisor (staff member). Each student selected the section in which he wished to participate according to his topical preference.

In addition to writing, students learned layout and photography, and were exposed to successful journalists and newsmakers during press conferences arranged for the course.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide entry learning experiences in the field of journalism and related occupations.
- To give students first-hand experience working in and around the news reporting industry.
- To motivate students to pursue careers and higher education for the journalism industry.
- To provide opportunities for self-expression through journalism, to students who were having difficulties in school work.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The Urban Journalism Workshop was conducted from 15 June to 10 July at American University.

b. Participants

A quota of 40 students was established for the summer Journalism Workshop. Twenty of these students were to be selected from Title I high schools, Dunbar and Cardozo, and the fees for these students paid from Title I funds. Also, the Title I students were paid $1.60 an hour for attendance at the workshop. The remaining 20 students were selected from other high schools in the city. Scholarship grants from various sources in the community provided the fees for this group of students. All of the students received money for transportation and lunch.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

Five of the seven teacher aides were graduates of former journalism workshop programs and were selected on the basis of their past experience with the project and their scholarship and leadership abilities. They were either June high school graduates or already attending college. The other two aides were a Howard University student and a graduate student of journalism at American University.

Since these staff members were for the most part workshop-trained, no training was necessary except for discussions with the administrator pertaining to their duties.

2) Student Activities

These have been covered in the Description part of this write up.

d) Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Specialized materials used included cameras and other photographic equipment and materials of American University, as well as the facilities of the University news room.

e) Personnel and Logistical Problems

The major problems stemmed from lack of sufficient funds to provide additional equipment (cameras, in particular) and field trips.

Because only a few cameras were available, students found it necessary to share equipment, which meant that many students did not have access to cameras when they needed them for newspaper assignments. Also, the students were not able to practice in the use of the camera.

The group visited the Washington Post and Evening Star newspapers. Many students expressed a desire to make additional trips.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 40 (20 from Title I schools)
Budget allocation: $7600

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

- Conference with director as to objectives and structure of the program.
- Observation of the program.
- Questionnaire administered to students participating in the workshop.
- Analysis of the questionnaire.
- Analysis of evaluation of the workshop by the staff.

b. Findings

1) Questionnaire

A questionnaire about the summer Journalism Workshop was completed by 27 students who participated. A summary of their responses is given at the end of the Urban Communications Workshop write-up.

2) Evaluation of Program by Staff Member

An in-depth evaluation of the workshop made by a staff member of the American University suggested the following:

a) The course failed to present a journalist from every major area of print. The class saw only four members of the journalistic field. In any case, lectures by visiting journalists should be preceded by class discussion regarding the area of journalism represented by each speaker.

b) Class tours were rather limited. The tours of the Evening Star and the Washington Post were successful but the schedule should have included a visit to printing and composition facilities.

c) In the future, more stress should be given to the theory of feature writing, critical review writing, and interpretive reporting, as well as to general reporting.

c. Conclusions

The Journalism Workshop met its objectives of giving students first-hand experience in the newspaper industry by publishing two eight-page tabloids. Students showed enthusiasm for the program, as evidenced by very little absenteeism and the completion of the course by all the students.

The facilities and staff expertise offered by the American University were invaluable for such a project.

Any weakness in the program, as expressed by some of the students in the questionnaire and by the in-staff evaluation of the workshop, could be solved by advance staff planning, to provide additional meaningful field trips, provide speakers representing more areas of the journalistic fields, provide specific training in various aspects of newspaper writing, and secure more camera equipment.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Re-examine the policy of paying the Title I students an hourly wage in lieu of guaranteeing students who successfully complete the workshop a part-time job in the industry. This would necessitate considerable advance contact with the local newspaper industry.
- The workshop staff should be composed of graduate assistants (two or three) and one or two former workshop students.
- The practice of publishing two editions of the paper in four weeks should be continued, planned, and budgeted.
- An effective check-in and check-out system for cameras should be implemented.
- With or without textbooks for the course, there should be a shelf of books on journalism for reference.

Urban Communications Workshops
Summer 1970

URBAN JOURNALISM WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE

Summer 1970

(N=27)

1. WHERE DID YOU HEAR ABOUT THE JOURNALISM WORKSHOP FOR THIS SUMMER?

Quite a few students heard about the Journalism Workshop through their English teachers at school. Some heard about it from their friends, and others from Mr. Lawrence Smith, Director of the Urban Communications Workshop. Pride, Inc., and the Mayor's Youth Committee also seemed to have been a major source of reference to the Journalism Workshop.

2. HAVE YOU HAD ANY PREVIOUS TRAINING OR EXPERIENCE IN JOURNALISM IF SO, EXPLAIN.

The majority of the students had not had any previous training or experience in journalism. A few had had previous experience while working on school newspapers and yearbooks, in various capacities, such as editors and assistant editors, or just working on school newspapers and publications in general.

3. WHAT DID YOU LIKE BEST ABOUT THE WORKSHOP THIS SUMMER?

Interviewing and photography seemed to be the most popular aspect of the workshop this summer Writing was quite popular with the students, also. Many of the students liked meeting various people. Some of them just liked everything about the workshop. There were various other high spots for other students, such as getting paid, not being crammed with a lot of boring talk, developing pictures, and one student stated "the experience and learning what journalism is really about."

4. WHAT DID YOU LIKE LEAST ABOUT THE WORKSHOP THIS SUMMER?

Many students didn't dislike any one thing in particular about the workshop. Some of the things some students didn't particularly care for were:

- Some people had no interest in journalism or ability for it...they just came because they were paid.
- I didn't get enough photography.
- Press conferences, layouts, and the never-ending "I don't knows" from the people around me.
- The delay in pay.
- The hours and the limited time period for the workshop.

URBAN JOURNALISM WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

- When I was sent out on an assignment and I asked one of the student teachers where I could get information on the person or organization I was supposed to interview, they couldn't tell me where to get the information. And at the beginning of the course, the booklet that was given out to the students said to know about the person or organization you were to interview.
- Sometimes the editors were too hard.
- Writing up the stories and some of the interviews.
- The way we were treated at first. Some of it was hard and a little frustrating, but in the end I benefited from it.

5. DO YOU PLAN TO CONTINUE IN THE JOURNALISM FIELD AFTER THE WORKSHOP IS COMPLETED? IF YES, IN WHAT AREA?

Many of the students do not plan to continue in the field of journalism. Quite a few students weren't sure or didn't know just yet about their futures in journalism. Some of the students did plan to continue in this field. Some of their responses were as follows:

- Yes, photography.
- Yes, I plan to work on my high school paper and work with the paper that will be out in the fall (by this workshop), if possible, and any other opportunity which is offered me.
- I'd love to go into reporting. I'd want to be more of a local reporter and report the news so that it would be relevant and understandable to Black people in D.C.
- Yes, newspaper.
- I will go back to school and continue to be editor there.
- I'd like to continue in the field as a reporter, if possible, or writing editorials and features.

6. WHAT SUGGESTIONS DO YOU HAVE FOR IMPROVING THE WORKSHOP IF IT IS HELD NEXT SUMMER?

- Meaningful field trips.
- Books for reference; more photography. Either all students or none to be paid, and to have an equal chance to participate in the benefits, such as photography, since not everyone was instructed in that area.
- More study.
- More equipment, such as cameras.

URBAN JOURNALISM WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE (Continued)

- Better instructors.
- Take trips to see how a newspaper is put together and printed first-hand; have money; better lunches.
- More time, money, trips, and people.
- More experienced student teachers that know more about the assignments they send their students on and a little more about journalism.
- Have a tighter system of issuing cameras. Don't put the first paper out until the third week. Have specialists in reporting, review writing, editorial writing, etc., come in before the paper is started. Devote the first two weeks to actual learning of skills.
- More money, new director, better typewriters.
- Help the students to get paid on time, and help them find jobs.

Broadcast Workshop

A workshop offering instruction in film making, radio, and television, was conducted at American University from 3 August to 28 August, 1970. There were 40 high school students enrolled, 20 of whom attended Title I high schools (Dunbar and Cardozo).

The emphasis in this workshop was to train students for involvement in public service issues on radio, television, and in film making. The group prepared and presented a spot on the Voice of America radio program. It is expected that students from this workshop will be active in broadcast clubs at their respective schools during the regular school year.

There are college scholarships available for talented students in this field. The Director of the workshop recommended that a year-round workshop be established for high school students. The four-week summer program could serve as a testing ground to discover those students who showed enough talent and interest to pursue this field as a career. After the completion of a year's training, the staff at American University would aid students in obtaining college scholarships.

MATHEMATICS FOR UNDERACHIEVERS (Elementary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was designed as a six-week remedial program for underachievers in mathematics. The instruction was highly individualized and based upon remediation of weaknesses as revealed by diagnostic tests. A laboratory technique was used in which the class time was divided into a clinic period for diagnosis and the planning of remedial work, followed by a math laboratory period in which students engaged in varied purposeful activities to develop or reinforce mathematical concepts.

Similar mathematics laboratories, employing the techniques used in the summer program, are planned for the regular school year in selected areas of the District of Columbia Public Schools.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide highly individualized instruction based on remediation of weaknesses.
- To build interest of pupils through the use of games, puzzles, and discovery exercises.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program was conducted from 22 June through 31 July, in four Title I elementary schools: Perry, Lewis, Goding, and Ludlow.

b. Participants

Approximately 180 students in grades three through six enrolled in this program. In most cases, school principals submitted applications for students who showed weaknesses in mathematics. In a few instances, parents made requests for their children to attend. All the students had attended a Title I school in June 1970.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

A team of three teachers in each of the four schools began by administering a diagnostic test to each student. The test results were used as a guideline for planning lessons that would aid in overcoming the individual student's weaknesses.

2) Student Activities

Each student worked individually in his area of weakness. Checklists were used to rate accomplishment. The student checklists were devised from the results of these tests.

d. Personnel and Logistical Problems

The major problem was that this program was not planned and publicized early enough in the spring. Because of this, the initial testing of students was conducted the first week of the program, delaying the actual remedial class work. The tests ordered were not delivered on time, so arrangements had to be made for borrowing them.

Enrollment did not meet expectations because on the last day of school many parents were still unaware of the existence of the program.

4. BUDGET OF THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 180
Allocated budget: $15,185

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The diagnostic tests and checklists were the main sources of evaluation. Teachers also watched for an increased interest in and enthusiasm for mathematics.

b. Findings

Individual students showed growth through mastery of the items on their checklists.

A comparison of the pre- and post-test scores showed a five-month median gain during the six-week period.

An increase in interest and enthusiasm was indicated by the number of students who joined the program late on recommendation of friends already enrolled.

c. Conclusions

The mathematics clinic seemed beneficial to a number of students. Many showed significant growth in months of gain during the six-week program.

Smaller classes did permit more individualized instruction, which proved effective for those present, but due to the low enrollment and attendance, the program did not have as great an effect as anticipated.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Inform the school administrators of existing summer plans at least a month before the close of school.
- Provide official communication to parents before the program begins, to secure their cooperation as well as to build their interest.
- Provide a three-day workshop for teachers who will be involved, to:

    become familiar with all plans,
    become aware of each person's responsibilities,
    prepare minimum goals, and
    check applications for placement of pupils.

- Recreational and academic programs should not be scheduled which compete -- many children who might have benefited from this program became involved in conflicting recreational programs which took them out of the classroom two days a week.
- Provide an "open house" for parents.
- Set up preschool summer programs to free older children of home responsibilities so they can attend summer programs.
- A follow-up study of the students in this program should be made during the regular school year to determine if the growth in skills during the summer program carried over in their regular school work.

MATHEMATICS ENRICHMENT (Elementary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The Mathematics Enrichment Program was designed for elementary school pupils who had potential in mathematics (as opposed to the Mathematics for Underachievers Program for those needing remedial work). With a variety of activities, teachers aimed at building enthusiasm and interest in mathematics.

2. OBJECTIVES

The major objective was to build enthusiasm and interest in mathematics.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

This three-week program was in session for the students from 3 July through 31 July, with a two-week planning seminar prior to this for the teachers involved, to plan specific activities best suited for the purpose of the program.

Classes were located in four Title I elementary schools: Ludlow, Goding, Lewis, and Perry.

b. Participants

Children were selected by the principals of their schools on the basis of average ability and interest. These children will enter grades 5, 6, and 7 in September 1970, and were divided by sex and grade as follows:

Grade in June	Boys	Girls	
4	5	9	
5	4	4	
6	6	9	
Total	15	22	= 37

All the students involved had attended a Title I school in June 1970.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff was composed of four mathematics resource teachers from the D.C. Public Schools. The teachers involved had a two-week seminar in order to plan specific activities which would be suited for the program.

2) Student Activities

Students were encouraged to explore mathematics through games, puzzles, and experiments. The main purpose was to force students to use their imagination to make predictions and reason out solutions.

d. Personnel and Logistical Problems

The teachers found that some of the students were unaware of many basic concepts. Since an understanding of these concepts is necessary for enrichment, the teachers took time to teach the basic understandings.

Enrollment was surprisingly low, perhaps as a result of the late approval of the program. Because the children had to be selected by the school principals, little could be done to resolve this.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 37
Allocated budget: $7,026

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

Evaluation was conducted through observation of the program, conferences with the director as to the objectives and structure of the program, and a general questionnaire filled out by the administrator.

b. Findings

The students who came to the program were not properly selected for high potential in mathematics; on the contrary, teachers found that much of the time had to be spent in teaching fundamentals.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- A follow-up study should be conducted to determine the effectiveness of this summer program, for the teachers as well as the students who participated in it.
- In the future, teachers and principals should be made aware of the program plans early enough to be able to select an adequate number of children with high potential in mathematics.

MATHEMATICS INSTITUTE (Elementary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was a college credit course for elementary school teachers who will be teaching in the Math Laboratories, Math Clinics, and the Monroe Education Project in Title I elementary schools during the regular school year. The course included three areas of study:

Mathematics content essential for every teacher of elementary school mathematics;

Active participation in a seminar/workshop, utilizing teacher-made and commercial materials for teaching which will be found in mathematics laboratories; and

Observation/demonstration periods, for experiences with the development and presentation of laboratory-type lessons.

2. OBJECTIVES

To strengthen the mathematics background of elementary school teachers from Title I schools, and to provide experiences for them in using new materials and techniques for implementation during the 1970-71 regular school year.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The Mathematics Institute operated six hours daily from 6 July through 31 July, at Ludlow Elementary School.

b. Participants

Twenty teachers enrolled for the course, nineteen of whom successfully completed the program.

There were two groups of elementary school children (approximately 10 pupils of primary grade level and 12 of intermediate grade level) with whom the teachers worked during the Institute.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

A resource mathematics specialist conducted demonstration classes in the use of the various techniques studied in the course. To facilitate the implementation of math programs in the fall school term, teachers kept detailed notes of the ideas, techniques, and experiences which evolved from the Institute.

Teachers were assisted in developing teaching aids to be used during the academic year.

2) Student Activities

Students benefited from the expert teaching of a specialist in the field.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Commercial and ordinary supplies (construction paper, scissors, paste, etc.) were used in developing teaching aids.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

There was some difficulty in the recruitment of students of the proper grade level to participate in the Institute.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of teachers:	20
Number of students:	22
Allocated budget:	$20,000

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

Evaluation was accomplished by means of observation, interviews, and review of the formal proposal submitted for funding.

b. Findings

Teacher enthusiasm for the Institute was high. They felt that the new concepts learned and the development of new teaching aids would enable them to present mathematical concepts more effectively to students during the regular school year.

c. Conclusions

Standardized tests have revealed that the performance in mathematics of students in the target area of the District of Columbia Public Schools is low in comparison with other large cities with similar school populations. Specialized training for teachers in the area of teaching mathematics should benefit the students. While the Institute served a relatively small number of teachers, it is hoped that this corps of teachers can serve as training teachers in the schools where they work.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

A follow-up study, including interviews with the teachers who participated in the summer Mathematics Institute, should be conducted during the 1970-71 school year.

If budget permits, it is recommended that similar institutes for specialized training in the teaching of mathematics for teachers be continued in a summer program next year.

DEVELOPMENTAL MATHEMATICS PROGRAM (Model School Division)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

This program had a double purpose: it was designed to enhance the education of both students and teachers. Students were provided with a number of enriching learning experiences in mathematics, and teachers were provided with a training and practice ground in the instruction of mathematics.

2. OBJECTIVES

It should be noted that the objectives listed, although referring directly to students, were meant to be applied to teachers as well. One of the overall objectives of the program was that teachers learn how to accomplish these objectives in their teaching.

- To enliven interest and increase understanding and appreciation for mathematics.
- To use a laboratory approach in the teaching of mathematics.
- To provide children with a wide variety of learning opportunities.
- To provide students with a variety of materials to use.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program started on 22 June and continued through 31 July 1970. All schools in the Model School Division participated. The center for most of the activities was at Seaton Elementary School.

b. Participants

The pupils all came from the Model School Division. There was no particular means of selection - students participated on a voluntary basis.

The staff consisted of a coordinator and a number of consultants. The consultants worked with the teacher participants in both a demonstration and lecture capacity.

c. Activities

1. Staff Activities

The staff participated in two types of activities: they took part in training sessions, which included group interchange and the experience of consultants specialized in various aspects of mathematics; and they applied what had been learned in the training sessions to actual classroom situations. Students were involved in this part. Thus, the program provided a balance between theory and practice.

2. Student Activities

Students took part in a variety of new learning activities and experiences. New techniques and methods that teachers had learned in their training sessions were tried out on the students.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

The specialized materials and equipment used were: multi-base arithmetic blocks, colored rods, attribute games and problems, Madison Project "shoe boxes" discs, centimeter blocks, peg games, tower puzzles, equation games, Cuisinaire rods, scales, tapes, and calculators.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

The main problem resulted from the fact that teachers were not paid on time, which tended to decrease the morale as well as to create hostilities in some instances.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of teachers: 37
Number of students: 185
Budget allocation: $25,200

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The Innovation Team of the Model School Division conducted its own in-depth evaluation of this program. It consisted, for the most part, of a series of questionnaires and forms given to the students, teachers, administrators, and consultants.

A list of the forms and questionnaires used follows:

Name of Form	Who Completed It
Participant Involvement	Teachers, Administrators
Observation Form	Teachers, Students
Evaluation of Consultant Performance	Consultants, Administrators
Documentarian's Feedback	Administrators
Open Classroom Interview	Teachers
Student Information	Students
Student Interview	Students
Elementary Student Daily Checklist	Students
Secondary Student Daily Checklist	Students
My Summer Teacher	Students
Staff Questionnaire	Students

The results of these questionnaires are being compiled, and a separate report will be made of the results.

Visits were made to the program by the staff of the George Washington University for observation, and interviews with program administrators and teachers conducted.

A follow-up study of both teachers and students will be carried out during the 1970-71 school year. It is believed that the effects of the summer program can best be evaluated by the resulting performance of the students and teachers during the regular school year.

b. Findings

- The enthusiasm of all participants - teachers, students, and administrators - was extremely high.
- The program showed evidence of detailed planning and organization.
- New materials and methods of teaching mathematics were experimented with and tried out.
- According to teacher evaluations, the consultants were effective and useful.
- Teachers benefited from each other's experiences.
- Students, according to checklist evaluations which they filled out, found the program to be useful and enjoyable.

c. Conclusions

From the observations made by the evaluation team, and the questionnaires filled out by the participants, the program seemed to have been successful in meeting its objectives. As was true of the reading component of this program, the enthusiasm evidenced by all the participants was overwhelming. One of the major factors that contributed to the success of this program was the variety of innovative materials available for use with the students. In addition, the classes were small enough and there were enough teachers to allow individual student attention. In effect, then, the summer institute served as an idealized teaching-learning situation; however, whether or not this can be carried over into the regular school setting remains to be seen. Thus, the final evaluation will lie in the observation of the student and teacher participants during the regular school and classroom situations. This will require a follow-up study during the regular school year.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The teachers who took part in the program were asked to make recommendations; these included:

- More materials should be available.
- More released time should be given teachers for in-service training.
- There should be follow-up support from the Innovation Team.
- There should be workshops for the slow learners.
- There should be more sharing between schools.

In addition, the following recommendations are also made:

- Follow-up should be conducted of the teacher participants in the summer program to determine whether the program actually did help them in teaching mathematics and directing others.
- Follow-up should be conducted of the student participants in the program to determine which teaching methods and materials were most effective, and how mathematics skills have been improved.
- Better estimates should be made of materials and supplies needed in the program so that it would not be handicapped by lack of teaching materials.
- Adequate liaison should be maintained with the appropriate fiscal office to insure payment of salaries on time.

MULTI-STATION MATHEMATICS LABORATORIES (Secondary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was designed to provide interesting and meaningful experiences for secondary school students who wanted to improve their skills or explore new areas in the field of mathematics.

This was to be accomplished by equipping multi-station laboratories with audiovisual aids, programmed texts, math literature, and models.

2. OBJECTIVES

To provide clinical and laboratory approaches in helping students with mathematical problems.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

This program included six weeks of teacher participation and four weeks of student involvement. The teachers were from Macfarland, Hamilton, and Evans Junior High Schools, and the students were from Shaw, Stuart, Hamilton, Terrell, Langley, Macfarland, and Roper Junior High Schools, and Dunbar High School.

b. Participants

There were three teachers and thirty-five students in the program, from schools as listed above.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

Staff activities included securing equipment and supplies, setting up and disassembling equipment, lesson planning, preparation of worksheets, grading papers, etc. Teachers also prepared a list of available equipment which could be used in a laboratory setting at the schools to which they would return as regular teachers.

2) Student Activities

Students selected the area of study in mathematics with which they had the greatest difficulty.

Field trips were taken to the Weather Bureau, International Business Machines, Smithsonian Institution, and the Bureau of Engraving.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

A set of SRA drill tapes and a set of Encyclopedia Britannica film loops were received for use. Pencils, paper, chalk, and other miscellaneous supplies were obtained from the regular budget. Three double-door storage cabinets were ordered to house the supplies and equipment.

The following equipment was in use in the Laboratory and is housed during the regular school year at the location appearing in parentheses: two adding machines (Dunbar), two calculators (Dunbar), two tape recorders (Dunbar and property of teacher), one math-matex or film loop projector (Math Department), one overhead projector (Dunbar), one electronic calculator (property of the Math Department on loan from the manufacturer), and one cassette recorder (Math Department).

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

Teachers from Title I schools were not available to teach this program. Supplies had not arrived two weeks before the end of the program.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of Teachers: 3
Number of Students: 35
Budget allocation: $15,000

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The data for this evaluation were acquired by interviews, observation, and inspection of the Program Summary Statement obtained from the Budget Department.

b. Findings

Student enrollment in this program was far below anticipation: 67 students submitted applications, 35 were enrolled, and 20 were present on the date of observation.

The program succeeded in demonstrating the effectiveness of the use of audiovisual equipment in teaching mathematics. Regular Dunbar teachers who visited the program learned of the equipment housed at their school during the regular school year.

c. Conclusions

This program was not organized to meet the needs of students and teachers in Title I schools.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Information pertaining to the equipment, materials, and supplies available should be submitted and checked against request before approval for funding.

Personnel and schools from which the children come should be clearly defined in order to guarantee serving students and teachers from Title I schools.

COMPUTER EXPERIENCES (Secondary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was designed to provide on-the-job training experiences in data processing for high school students having previous experience in a special program during the past academic school year.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide on-the-job experience in data processing, computer mathematics, and related subjects.
- To coordinate the theoretical training received at the Armstrong Educational Center in data processing with its practical application in a work situation.
- To give students greater insight into the many different facets of this new field.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program started on 26 June and continued through 27 August 1970. Dunbar High School was the only school involved in the program.

b. Participants

A total of three students from Dunbar High School took part in the program.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

One staff member at the Armstrong Educational Center assisted in placing the three student participants in data processing jobs at three commercial institutions in Washington, D.C.

2) Student Activities

The students in this program operated and learned about various pieces of data-processing equipment; they worked with computer programs, and generally were given the opportunity of enhancing their knowledge in data processing and computer work.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Other than the data processing and computer equipment, there were no specialized materials, supplies, and equipment used.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

There were only three student participants in the program, as opposed to the projected total of fifteen.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 3
Budget allocation: $3000 -- used primarily to pay the salaries of the student participants.

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The evaluation procedures for this program included:

- Interviews with the program director, and
- Observation of the program.

b. Findings

There seems to have been a lack of communication between the program director and the individual supervisors of the students at their place of work. The supervisors were not quite sure as to the manner in which they should handle the students. Apparently the roles and objectives were not defined clearly enough.

Only three students participated in the program, thus making it quite an expensive enterprise.

c. Conclusions

The program would have been more effective had there been better communication between the program director and the individual supervisors. There was generally too little control of the students by the program administrators.

Also, the fact that only three students participated in the program limits its overall effectiveness, in that it did not reach enough students.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

If this program is to be continued, it is recommended that:

- there be more communication between the program administrators and the individual supervisors;
- the individual supervisors be given an orientation session before the start of the program, so that they are aware of the objectives and of their own responsibility; and
- efforts be made to include a greater number of students.

SUMMER SCHOLARSHIPS (Secondary)

Summer 1970

George Washington University Workshop for Careers in the Arts
Georgetown University College Orientation
Howard University African Languages
St. Albans International Seminar
Smithsonian Studio Summer Art Workshop
Trinity Summer Middle School

There is a growing concern in universities and colleges, private secondary schools, and national institutes and museums in the United States to relate and make a contribution to the peoples of the inner-city, particularly the young people. There are many talented students in the deprived areas of the city who, if trained, can be of productive service to themselves and to society. The community is beginning to accept a collective responsibility to provide these young people with the tools needed to develop their talents and constructively unleash their creativity.

The city of Washington, D.C., is well endowed with five major universities, numerous private schools and colleges with high scholastic standards, and government institutions such as the Smithsonian Institution and the National Gallery of Art. Funds through Title I - ESEA have made it possible, during the past five years, to award scholarships to deprived students from Title I target areas to attend special summer programs at many of these institutions in Washington.

The advantages these programs offer to the students are many:

- These institutions have the necessary facilities, expensive equipment, and staff experts to provide training in specialized areas, such as television, radio, and film making.
- Many programs have offered students the opportunity to work with other students who come from every segment of society and, in some instances, students from other countries of the world.
- Several programs have provided valuable support to students with college potential.
- Other programs have offered professional training in dance, theater, and art.

What effect these programs may have on changing the future lives of the students who participated would be difficult to measure in quantitative terms.

George Washington University Workshop for Careers in the Arts

1. DESCRIPTION

This program provided training in creative expression through various art media. The workshop was divided into three components: The music and dance workshop involved instruction in ballad and jazz music, and in modern and free-style dance. The drama workshop consisted of classes in vocal exercises, pantomime, improvisation, and theater history; students were given an opportunity to perform a number of times throughout the summer. The art workshop gave students experience in drawing, painting, silk screening, and collage making.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide professional training in the arts.
- To help place students in jobs which provide such training.
- To establish on a citywide basis a center where students can get a comprehensive "art education" until it can be phased into a public school.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

This program was conducted at The George Washington University from 22 June through 31 August. The program will be continued on a part-time basis in the fall.

b. Participants

A total of 182 students from high schools throughout the city were enrolled in the summer program. The Director wrote letters to principals and guidance personnel of the public schools, parochial schools, welfare organizations, Junior Village, and the Neighborhood Planning Council, who notified students with a definite interest and talent in the creative arts. Students submitted applications, which were reviewed by the Director and his staff, followed by interviews of the students.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff consisted of 15 instructors and 3 administrators. Some of the instructors were teachers from the public schools and universities and some were professionals in the arts.

George Washington University Workshop for Careers in the Arts
(Continued)

2) Student Activities

Students were invited to take courses in areas of the arts in order to acquire skills in both performance and the "behind-the-scene" duties.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

The main materials required for this program were art supplies and auditorium space for rehearsals and performances.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

Auditoriums and rehearsal space were difficult to find and classes often had to be moved from day to day.

Funds from the District of Columbia Public Schools were not received until the program was already in progress.

4. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

- Observation of the program in progress.
- Consultation and interviews with the program director.

b. Findings

- The program was well planned by talented and dedicated instructors in the art media.
- Student enthusiasm and attendance were high.

c. Conclusions

Talented art students received an opportunity to use their talents, to associate with other talented students, and to judge the competition in their chosen profession.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

This program would probably be profitable on a citywide full-time basis for students seriously pursuing a career in the arts. It would provide the necessary professional training in addition to a scale with which to judge each student's talent and potential in relation to other students pursuing a similar profession.

Georgetown University College Orientation

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was designed for students in the District of Columbia who had completed their sophomore and/or junior year in high school. It provided intensive instruction in English, reading, mathematics, biology, and chemistry. In addition, cultural activities and individual counseling services were available to each student. It was a remedial as well as an enrichment program with primary thrust directed toward increasing the likelihood that these students would be admitted to and succeed in college.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide intellectual and cultural stimulation to students who have college potential.
- To help students understand that college is within their grasp and that it is a desirable goal.
- To provide additional skills necessary for college through review of basics and then a follow-through of application.
- To give students confidence that they do have the capacity and can develop the abilities to do college work.
- To act as a supplement to what the secondary school provides.
- To help students consider a college choice.
- To simulate a college environment including social and academic experiences.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Location

This program was conducted at Georgetown University from 20 June through 14 August.

b. Participants

There were 53 students who participated in this program; all had completed either their sophomore or junior year in high school. These students were from the following schools:

	Soph.	Jr.		Soph.	Jr.
Anacostia	3	3	Gonzaga	1	0
Ballou	2	0	McKinley	0	1
Cardozo	0	6	Spingarn	8	8
Coolidge	1	0	Western	0	1
Dunbar	3	1			
Eastern	8	7	Total	26	27

Georgetown University College Orientation
(Continued)

The ten students in this group from Title I schools (Cardozo and Dunbar) were awarded scholarships through Title I funding.

Students were recommended by teachers, principals, and counselors, after which visits were made to the schools for personal interviews with each student. Students were then selected on the basis of interest and economic need.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff consisted of 23 members, as follows:

- 1 Director
- 1 Coordinator
- 1 Senior counselor
- 4 English instructors
- 3 Mathematics instructors
- 2 Chemistry instructors
- 2 Reading specialists
- 3 Biology instructors
- 6 Tutor counselors

The staff participated in a general orientation period. During the program they attended weekly staff meetings.

2) Student Activities

Every effort was made to simulate a college experience academically, culturally, and socially. Students lived on campus and followed normal dormitory regulations. Tickets for cultural events were bought in blocks and students voted for cultural events they wished to attend.

Each student took four courses: English, reading, mathematics, and either biology or chemistry. They had many speakers, both from Georgetown University and from outside.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

The major materials required for this program were textbooks, films, workbooks, and laboratory manuals.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

The major problems encountered in this program were typical to most colleges and universities. In dormitory living, females occasionally did not observe curfew hours and complained about lack of visitation rights.

Georgetown University College Orientation
(Continued)

Tardiness was a problem in some classes, and some apathy was noted among a few students. A consciousness of a black and white difference was observed, with occasional tension between staff and students. In general this seemed to be just normal youthful rebellion against authority.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

The ten Title I students received Title I scholarships of $500 each.

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

Evaluation procedures included observation of the program, conferences with the program director, and a general questionnaire completed by the program director.

b. Findings and Conclusions

- All students received intensive training in English, reading, mathematics, and biology or chemistry.
- Students experienced cultural activities and received counseling services.
- A large percentage of the students in previous programs have entered college and received financial aid: in 1965 - 82% of the GUCO program enrolled in college; in 1966, 63%; and in 1967, 81%.
- A follow-up study should be made of this summer's students to determine whether this year's program was as effective as in previous years.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Classes should be smaller.
- Each student received an allowance of $15 a week. A deduction was made for absences, tardiness, and other infractions of rules. In the future, students should earn this allowance for approved behavior.
- Some method should be found to deal with the problems students will encounter in college with regard to authority and student rebellion.
- A formal follow-up of all students by the secondary school should be designed and implemented, since some students are lost in school transfers.

Howard University - African Languages

This program, as with some of the other summer programs, was funded jointly by Title I and by other sources. There were fifteen inner-city children who participated in this program, three of whom were from Title I schools. The program had originally been planned for 30-40 students.

This program added to the cultural enrichment of the participants, and served to enlarge their areas of interest and to eliminate many of the commonly held stereotypes of Africa. Contact, on a college campus, with other students and instructors from outside the Title I area was a positive factor in overcoming educational problems of the Title I students.

The curriculum for the course covered various aspects of African history and culture in addition to Zulu language instruction.

St. Albans International Seminar

1. DESCRIPTION

The St. Albans International Seminar was a coeducational institute for secondary school students. It provided both historical and contemporary international studies in Africa, Southeast Asia, and the Middle East.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide a stimulating program in international studies.
- To expose students to the international resources available in the Washington area.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

This program was in operation for five weeks, from 22 June through 24 July. All classes and seminars met at the St. Albans School, Massachusetts and Wisconsin Avenues, N.W., Washington.

b. Participants

Thirty-three of the thirty-six students entered the seminars from junior and senior high schools in the District of Columbia; two entered from George C. Marshall High School in Fairfax County, Virginia; and one was from Fairmont Heights High School in Prince Georges County, Maryland. Students were recommended by counselors and/or social studies teachers.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

There were six faculty members who conducted this program. Besides straightforward classroom work, seminar discussions, field trips, and expert guest speakers from the Washington area were used.

2) Student Activities

Twenty-four of the students pursued a three-course African Studies schedule of Swahili, African History, and a Seminar on Africa. The

St. Albans International Seminar
(Continued)

remaining twelve students pursued a three-course Southeast Asian Studies schedule of Cultural Analysis of Southeast Asia, Southeast Asian History, and Seminars on Southeast Asia.

4. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

Observation of the program, conferences with the program director, and a general questionnaire completed by the program administrator.

b. Findings

This program seemed to achieve the objectives by providing an enriching and stimulating experience in international studies. The academically well-trained staff aided in exposing the students to the international resources available in Washington through field trips to embassies and a variety of expert speakers.

c. Conclusions

The International Seminar has developed a thriving substantial program over the past eight years.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

No particular problems were found in this program, but it has been recommended that in the future St. Albans centralize their summer programs to make the most efficient use of the campus facilities so that all activities, tennis, swimming, etc., could be coordinated.

Summer Scholarships
Summer 1970

Smithsonian Studio Summer Art Workshop

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was designed to provide an opportunity for talented secondary school art students in the D.C. Public Schools to experiment in various media in a studio environment at the Smithsonian Institution.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To develop art appreciation through exposure to various media.
- To provide an opportunity to experiment in various media in a studio environment.
- To provide a relaxed atmosphere to heighten the pupils' creativity and productivity.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

Classes were held in a studio at the Smithsonian Institution Complex - Natural History Building, from 22 June through 31 July.

b. Participants

The classes were restricted to 62 junior and senior high school students. They were selected upon the recommendation of their art teachers as to their artistic talent and general attitude toward school. There were four Title I students in the group, two from Shaw and one each from Cardozo and Dunbar.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff was selected from permanent personnel employed by the D.C. Public Schools.

Smithsonian Studio Summer Art Workshop
(Continued)

Demonstrations and talks were given by local artists to acquaint students with the use of acrylic paints. Short talks with slides and films were provided as well as a workshop demonstration/ student participation session.

2) Student Activities

Students received studio art experience in the following media: drawing, painting, and sculpturing. Also, students sketched and painted in areas of the city near the Smithsonian complex. Each week a bus field trip out of the city was planned. The students took their sketch pads and painting equipment for use on these trips.

Art appreciation was promoted through several walking trips to the National Gallery of Art, the Smithsonian Freer Gallery, and the National Collection of Fine Arts.

The students visited Howard University where they attended a lecture on print making. They also saw the excellent collection of African art in one of the permanent galleries at Howard.

Free lunches were provided each day, picnic style, on the Mall behind the studio area. Free bus tickets were used for transportation to and from class each day.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Drawing: pencils, crayons, charcoal, pen, ink, and wash

Painting: acrylic colors, opaque and transparent (canvas boards, cardboard, and paper)

Sculpturing: clay (firing type and plastaline), plaster casting, plaster molding, plaster carving

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

The original space to be provided by Smithsonian was not ready until after the program had been running for two weeks. No custodial services were available for cleaning equipment or emptying trash containers. Sinks and water were not available in the studio. Water had to be obtained from the janitor closet, which was sometimes locked.

Smithsonian Studio Summer Art Workshop
(Continued)

4. EVALUATION

a. Procedure

A questionnaire was completed by the director of the program. A follow-up of the children in the program is planned for the regular school year.

b. Findings and Conclusions

Students most definitely benefited from the studio experience. They were provided with additional experiences in art, plus an exposure to other art students and professional works of art.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

- The culminating activity, open house and exhibit, should be held on the Thursday of the last week of the program.
- All officials and persons concerned should attend at the time of the open house and exhibit only, in order to see work done by the students.
- The studio where the class is to assemble should be ready by the day the program opens.
- Materials, especially paints and brushes, should be ready for all students on the first day of the program instead of two days before the open house and exhibit.

TRINITY COLLEGE SUMMER MIDDLE SCHOOL

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was designed for students entering grades 5-10 in September, and brought together girls and boys with varying backgrounds and talents. It provided concentrated work in history, English, mathematics, and reading, with special attention given to personal and cultural development. The school was in session from 8:45 until 4:30. Morning sessions stressed academic activities and the afternoon sessions included all types of recreational activities.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide both remedial and enrichment academic activities for students during the summer.
- To provide a flexible program that will meet students' special interests.
- To provide recreational activities.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

This program was conducted from 22 June through 31 July, at Trinity College, Michigan Avenue and Franklin Street, NE.

b. Participants

Pupils were drawn from all schools in the Washington area, public, private, and parochial. Of the total enrollment of 198, 65 students were from Title I schools, 18 of whom were awarded scholarships through Title I funding. Pupils were selected on recommendations of both teachers and counselors. A breakdown of the students by grade and sex is as follows:

Grade	Total Enrollment			From Title I Schools		
	Boys	Girls	Total	Boys	Girls	Total
5	12	14	26	3	1	4
6	14	22	36	8	5	13
7	22	25	47	8	8	16
8	14	29	43	4	9	13
9	9	15	24	5	6	11
10-11	4	18	22	1	7	8
Total	75	123	198	29	36	65

TRINITY COLLEGE SUMMER MIDDLE SCHOOL
(Continued)

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

Instruction was provided by teams of teachers made up of experienced teachers and Master of Arts in Teaching candidates at Trinity College. College instructors were available as special resource people. Teachers provided a variety of learning situations: tutorial, group discussions, field trips, and regular classes. A breakdown of the faculty follows:

	Experienced Teachers	MAT Candidates	Total for each Discipline
English	3	3	6
Mathematics	3	1	4
Social Studies	1	4	5
Reading	1	-	1

Teachers participated in weekly seminars and daily team meetings as part of the continuing education of the staff.

2) Student Activities

Students participated in both academic and recreational activities. In the mornings, classes were conducted in history, mathematics, reading, and English. If a group of students was interested in a specific academic area, every effort was made to design a program to meet this demand.

In the afternoons, students participated in such recreational activities as swimming, tennis, baseball, and bowling.

d. Personnel and Logistical Problems

The major problem with this program was lack of funds. Thirty-five Title I students had been declared eligible for the program but were unable to attend because of lack of scholarship funds.

4. EVALUATION

a. Procedure

A questionnaire was completed by the director of the program.

TRINITY COLLEGE SUMMER MIDDLE SCHOOL
(Continued)

b. Findings and Conclusions

This program appeared to meet its objectives of providing remedial and enrichment activities as well as recreational activities for students during the summer months. A follow-up study will have to be conducted on these students to evaluate the benefits of the program.

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

More D.C. public school teachers should be involved in the program. This would provide an opportunity to enrich the learning experience of the individual student and provide teachers an environment for planning, executing, and evaluating innovative ideas.

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS (Model School Division)

(Shaw Summer Enrichment Program)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was designed to give students from the area an opportunity to learn certain skills and vocations during the summer. It was felt that by providing such an opportunity for students during the summer months when they often have nothing to do, the school would be filling a necessary gap for the community.

2. OBJECTIVES

Each of the six separate areas of instruction had its own objectives:

Commercial Art:

- To give each student a basic foundation in how to design and make commercial posters.

Clothing and Textiles:

- To release the full potential of each student.
- To utilize all of the student's skills and abilities.
- To develop leadership.
- To create wholesome emotional attitudes towards students, parents, and administrators.

Library Skills:

- To enable students to learn library procedures and techniques.
- To provide opportunity for vocational exploration by practice in library service.
- To popularize reading among all students.
- To enjoy varied group/reading experiences.

Printing:

- To teach the basic fundamentals of the various printing processes.

Metal Craft:

- To teach the basic fundamentals of metal craft.
- To introduce the students to proper care and use of hand tools and machines.
- To introduce tool techniques and job procedures.

Woodworking:

- To develop the students' incentives for manual work in constructing projects from various wood samples.
- To develop within the students the constructive use of leisure time.
- To aid each student in developing a knowledge of the mathematical and technical aspects of wood construction.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The Summer Enrichment Program at Shaw Junior High School was conducted from 6 July through 7 August 1970. Students came from eleven schools, although the majority of them came from Shaw. A breakdown of the schools and the number of students from each may be seen below:

Shaw	41	Langley	1
Cardozo	2	Cook	1
Holy Redeemer	2	Sousa	1
St. Martin's	1	Beers	1
Lincoln	1	Stuart	1
Lewis	1	Total	53

b. Participants

A total of 53 students participated in this program, ranging from the fourth to the eleventh grade, and from nine to eighteen years of age. Students enrolled in the program solely of their own volition.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff consisted of six regular teachers from Shaw Junior High School and ten student aides.

2) Student Activities

Students chose the area in which they were interested and attended daily classes in that field.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

The specialized materials and supplies for this program consisted of the necessities for learning each of the skills offered, and included: sewing machines; benches; vises; cutting tools; welding, soldering, and brazing equipment; saws; hammers; planes; files; nails; rasps; braces; drills; carpenter squares; rulers; calipers; presses; fonts of type; other type-setting equipment; varieties of ink and paper; etc.

e. Personnel and Logistic Problems

The main difficulty with this program was that the number of students in attendance was not as great as expected. Secondary level students often have responsibilities, such as jobs or taking care of younger siblings, during the summer months, which often interfered with class attendance.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 53
Number of teachers: 6
Number of student aides: 10
Budget allocation: $30,000 (for both Garnet-Patterson and Shaw Community School Programs)

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

In that it is difficult to objectively measure the effects of a community school program, the main means of evaluation were:

- observation of the program, and
- interview with the program coordinator.

b. Findings

Although the two secondary level Model School Division Community School Programs at Shaw and Garnet-Patterson had been planned to accommodate 600 students, a total enrollment of only 53 students attended the Shaw program, and some of these 53 were elementary level students.

c. Conclusions

The school facilities and staff were organized in accordance with the program objectives, but were not fully utilized due to the small student participation.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Efforts should be made to include a greater number of students in this program. This might be aided by possibly adjusting the hours to times when students would have free time.

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS (Model School Division)

(Garnet-Patterson Summer Enrichment Program)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

An open community school was conducted at Garnet-Patterson Junior High School during the summer of 1970. Among the many activities offered were an academic summer school program in the morning, free lunch for children participating in community programs, an all-day skill workshop, and a community art program.

The morning academic program was open only to students from Garnet-Patterson and was designed to provide an opportunity for students to make up any failures in school subjects so they could pass on to the appropriate grade in the coming school year. All of the courses were non-graded.

The all-day skill workshop was open to anyone in the community from age 12 through 21, and offered courses in cooking, clothing, homemaking, mechanical drawing, woodwork, crafts, and physical fitness. The skill workshop was funded partly by the District Youth Summer Program.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide educational, social, and recreational activities for students in the Title I area. The programs were based on needs expressed by the community and the recommendations of the Community Advisory Council.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program was conducted from 22 June through 7 August at Garnet-Patterson Junior High School.

b. Participants

There were 95 students from Garnet-Patterson in the morning academic program. The average daily attendance in the skill workshop was 375 - about 190 boys and 175 girls.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff consisted of 8 teachers, 1 coordinator, 1 secretary, 3 community aides, and 3 custodial aids. This staff had worked together for two previous summer programs and were part of the regular Community School staff.

2) Student Activities

Students had an opportunity to attend academic classes in English (reading and language), math, social studies (Black Studies), and science. Students also participated in the Widening Horizons program, which consisted of guided tours in the Washington area to acquaint students with job and career opportunities.

d) Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Garnet-Patterson Junior High School has a well-equipped home economics unit which was utilized for the classes in cooking, clothing, and homemaking. The school also has an excellent shop unit with specialized equipment for printing, mechanical drawing, and woodwork. A special science unit was developed for the study of animal life.

e) Personnel and Logistical Problems

In order to relieve the coordinator of the heavy responsibility of coordinating both the academic program and the skill workshop, a community aide was appointed as liaison officer between the academic program and the skill workshop. This arrangement also gave the coordinator more time to devote to parent involvement in the total program.

The program could serve a greater number of participants if the building were air-conditioned.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 95 (academic program)
375 (skill workshop)
Number of teachers: 8
Allocated budget: $30,000 (for both Garnet-Patterson and Shaw Community School Programs)

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The evaluations procedures for this program consisted of:

- Observation of the program by the evaluation staff.
- Administrator's Questionnaire.

b. Findings

Small classes and individual attention seemed to be effective in reaching students who had difficulty with academic subjects during the regular school year. Students who had been "hall walkers", "class cutters", and disinterested in school work, attended the summer classes regularly. The majority of the total enrollment successfully completed the courses.

c. Conclusions

The summer school program was successful in meeting its objectives of providing an academic program for students. The large enrollment for the skill workshop was evidence that part of the program served community needs. The community school concept also stimulated parental interest in the total school program.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Title I should continue to contribute some financial support to the Garnet-Patterson Junior High Community School Program. This school serves a low-income area with many problems. The Community School Program seems to have alleviated some of these problems by involving the total community. This program was recently favorably reviewed by one of the Washington daily newspapers.

LOGAN COMMUNITY SCHOOL (Urban Service Corps)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The Logan Community School Program consisted of a variety of educational and skill development programs for participants from pre-kindergarten through adult age.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide enrichment for preschoolers that would serve as a foundation for kindergarten.
- To provide outdoor nature experiences for boys.
- To maintain and enhance reading skills during the summer weeks.
- To provide the opportunity to learn craft skills.
- To provide tutoring for kindergarten children who exhibited low potential for a successful first-grade experience.
- To provide enrichment for children and entire families through field trips.
- To provide swimming for community children.
- To provide good used clothing for nominal fees instead of charity.
- To provide free lunches.
- To provide evening recreation for the community.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program started on 15 June and continued through 14 August 1970. Logan Elementary School, and the surrounding community, was the only school involved in this program.

b. Participants

A total of 418 students took part in the program, which may be broken down as follows:

Logan Community School
Summer 1970

Grade	Girls	Boys	Total
Preschool			65
Kindergarten	6	10	16
1-3	60	33	93
4-6	44	140	184
7-9	32	28	60
			418

In addition, about 40 families took part in the program.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff consisted of both professionals and non-professionals, as follows:

Paid Professional Staff:	Director - 1 Professionals - 6
Paid Non-Professional Staff:	Community adults - 10 Work scholarships - 3 Community young adult - 1 Teenagers
Non-Paid Volunteer Staff:	Adults, community - 6 Adults, non-community - 6

The professional staff with the exception of the director served as full- or part-time teachers. The community adults worked in various capacities but mainly as Tot-Lot and Cottage Nursery teachers for preschool children. The teenagers were trained as assistants.

2) Student Activities

Students took part in such activities as camping, arts and crafts, typing, field trips, library instruction, story-telling, roller skating, tot-lots, and tutoring. In addition, adults were offered such courses as sewing, cooking, family field trips, and family swimming.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Among the specialized materials, supplies, and equipment were: paint, brushes, art supplies, tents, sleeping bags, regular camping equipment, typewriters, games, toys, blocks, etc.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

Custodians were uncooperative, gave little or no help with clean-up, and in some instances were hostile.

Attendance was a problem - students would constantly drop in and out of the program.

Some of the equipment was never received.

Many problems resulted from the lack of availability of buses to transport participants.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students:	418
Number of families:	40
Number of professional staff:	7
Number of non-professional staff:	14 (plus other teenagers)
Number of volunteer staff (non-paid):	12
Budget allocation:	$5,000

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The evaluation design of this program consisted of:

- Observation of the different activities,
- Interviews with the program director, and
- An Administrator's Questionnaire concerning the objectives and problems of the program.

b. Findings

The custodial staff and clean-up service needed improvement.

Attendance, although sporadic, was quite good for a community school program. The camping attendance was always at or near maximum level.

c. Conclusions

- The program seemed to have been successful in meeting its objectives.

- The community school concept needs time to develop. The people of the community cannot be expected, after years of apathy and lack of understanding or opportunity, to suddenly become involved and enthusiastic about their school. The interest and involvement develops slowly and with time.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The amount of money to be alloted should be decided well in advance of the start of the program. This would allow for the hiring and training of community personnel, for it is not possible to promise jobs without assurance of funding, and community people must be trained ahead of time, making it impossible to hire them on short notice.

Supplies and materials should be received at the beginning of the program.

MINI WOODWORK AND HOMEMAKING (Elementary)

Summer 1970

This program offered elementary school children an opportunity to develop and use skills in planning and organizing, while producing many items "just for fun." It was projected that many of the materials developed in this program could be used in the classroom during the regular school year.

The summer program was conducted at Mott Elementary School from 22 June to 31 July, and was staffed by two teachers. Approximately 35 students participated in the program. The budget allocation was $4,320.

Observers of the program felt it was successful in teaching the children to create items with their hands, and that the children were happy in this project. The program also served as a means of practical application to reinforce skills in reading and mathematics.

It was believed that the attitude toward school of the students who participated in this program could be favorably affected by this type of summer activity.

TERRELL COMMUNITY SCHOOL (Urban Service Corps)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The Terrell Community School Program had basically two purposes: to provide a program of cultural and experiential enhancement for students, and to aid in the education of blind community people.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide intensive help in academic subjects.
- To provide experiential learning opportunities related to special problems of learning.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program was conducted at Terrell Junior High School, from 15 June through 30 July 1970.

b. Participants

All of the students who participated in the program came from the Terrell community. They were chosen by the Community School teachers before the summer. Selection was based on priorities of those who would benefit most from attending the summer session.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff consisted of a coordinator, a secretary, two community aides, and seven teachers. The teachers who participated in the program were regular Community School teachers during the year. They thus had considerable experience in this area so that formal training was not necessary.

2) Student Activities

The activities in which the pupils took part were:

Guitar lessons - This program included elementary and junior high school students who took beginning and advanced guitar lessons.

Photography - Students in this program learned to take pictures as well as to develop and enlarge them. Most of the photographs made were of the neighborhood.

Home economics - This program provided elementary school-age girls with the opportunity to learn food preparation, table arrangement, and etiquette. Each week they prepared demonstration luncheons for adult guests.

French - Elementary school students not only worked on learning the French language but took related excursions as well.

Shoe repair - A group of boys were provided with the opportunity to learn how to work with leather materials.

Community band - Students were taught to play instruments, and learned to play in a group.

Program for the blind - A program was offered for the blind adults of the community. They were taught to read Braille, and to write. Some of them were prepared for and then given the high school equivalency test.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

The specialized materials, supplies, and equipment used consisted of: musical instruments, stoves, cooking utensils, food, tape recorders, leather, cutting and sewing tools, cameras, darkroom equipment, and Braille books.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

The main problem was that many supplies were late - some arrived after the program was over.

Another problem was that two of the teachers became seriously ill during the program, and although this was of course unavoidable, it did reduce the effectiveness of the program, according to the coordinator.

Terrell Community School
Summer 1970

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of staff members:	11
Number of students:	150
Budget allocation:	$10,000

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The procedures used for evaluating this program consisted of:

- Observation of the various activities, and
- Interviews with the program coordinator and the teachers.

b. Findings

The activities offered by this program were extremely diverse and gave students a wide range of choice.

The program for educating blind adults was unique for a Title I school.

c. Conclusions

The program was well planned and well executed.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Terrell Community School be continued next summer.

EARLY MORNING PHYSICAL FITNESS (Elementary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The Physical Fitness Program provided a summer physical fitness plan for Title I students, which included exercises, sports, and various other activities. The students were also provided with a nutritious breakfast and supervised shower facilities.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To develop self-discipline, self-confidence, and self-direction in students.
- To develop coordination, strength, and good body mechanics through physical activities.
- To provide students with a nutritious breakfast.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program started on 22 June and continued through 31 July. Three schools - Terrell Junior High School, Stuart Junior High School, and Dunbar High School - served as centers for the program. The students came from the various Title I elementary and junior high schools in the vicinity of the centers.

b. Participants

A total of 401 students participated in the summer program, ranging from the third to the ninth grade. A breakdown by sex and grade is as follows:

Grade	Girls	Boys	Total
3	18	42	60
4	12	41	53
5	15	73	88
6	22	85	107
7	13	37	50
8	18	16	34
9	5	4	9
Total	103	298	401

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff consisted of:

1 Coordinator
1 Clerk-typist
3 Center managers (1 male, 2 female)
12 Physical education teachers (9 male, 3 female)
8 Classroom teachers (6 male, 2 female)
10 Teacher aides (6 male, 4 female)

All staff members attended a workshop from June 22-26. All activities including breakfast and showers were supervised.

2) Student Activities

The daily student activities consisted of mass exercises, showers, breakfast, swimming, softball, basketball, soccer, touch football, and physical fitness tests. In addition, there were a number of special events scheduled throughout the summer, including a football game, a basketball foul-shooting contest, a swimming meet, a fishing trip, and an awards program.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

The specialized materials, supplies, and equipment used included all the things necessary for the program sports and activities: footballs, volleyballs, softballs, basketballs, nets, bats, swimming pool, etc. In addition, shower facilities, kitchen facilities, and food were utilized.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

- Lack of equipment
- Lack of cultural trips
- Conflicting of time with other youth programs

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 401
Budget allocation: $39,105

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The evaluation was based upon the following:

- The program was observed by various members of the evaluation staff.
- A questionnaire was given to the program coordinator.
- A follow-up study of students who had participated in the program will be conducted during the regular school year to see if there are any changes in their behavior and/or achievement.

b. Findings

- The program was able to accommodate only a limited amount of girls because the available staff were for the most part male.
- In a number of cases children not enrolled in the program were fed breakfast.
- Attendance was sporadic, due in part to other youth programs being conducted at the same time.

c. Conclusions

The program provided Title I students with a beneficial and constructive way of spending a portion of their time during the summer months.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

- An effort should be made to include more girls in the program.
- Parents should be included in the program.
- The necessary equipment should be supplied in order to allow for optimum functioning of the program.

PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES TEAMS

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The main purpose of the Pupil Personnel Services Teams Program is to assist seriously disadvantaged students in the Title I area in overcoming physical, educational, psychological, and emotional problems that could prevent them from benefiting from their educational opportunities. This is accomplished through the coordinated efforts of the Pupil Personnel Services Worker-Aide Teams and the Clinical Teams.

2. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the Pupil Personnel Services Teams summer program were:

- To identify, though cooperative efforts with the school staff, the problems of the most seriously disadvantaged students enrolled in Title I public and parochial schools.
- To assist school personnel in the development of a greater understanding of the background and problems of seriously disadvantaged students.
- To actively engage school personnel, parents, and the community in assisting these students with their problems.
- To foster home-school-community relationships to secure cooperation and understanding from the home, the school, and the community.
- To provide services of continuous contact and follow-up in order to alleviate the factors which prevent identified students from functioning at optimum potential.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program began on 22 June and continued through 31 July 1970. Identified students from all Title I elementary, junior high, and senior high schools were served.

b Participants

During the summer, the Teams followed up the students in their caseload for the preceding school year. The 1969-70 caseload was 11,868 students.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The activities of the Pupil Personnel Teams consisted of the following:

- Direct contacts with students in order to foster regular attendance, active participation, and adequate adjustment to school.
- Efforts to resolve any physical, psychological, social, or economic problems of identified students.
- Working with groups of children, providing supportive and therapeutic experiences, designed to enhance their self-image and competency.
- Working closely with special summer programs, personnel, and community resources to help provide the most meaningful and rewarding experiences aimed at returning identified children to school in September.
- Providing professional consultation services to all school officials, parents, and children, as required.
- Serving as a resource person for learning and behavioral problems.
- Providing interdisciplinary teams (psychologists, social workers, and speech correctionists) serving clusters of schools to provide consultative help to school personnel, as well as direct services to children.
- Providing individual assessments of children with learning and/or emotional problems (by psychologists on Clinical Teams).
- Attending Title I meetings.
- Closer and more in-depth work with children who had poor attendance records during the regular school year.
- Updating the records and files for each student receiving Pupil Personnel Services attention.

2) Student Activities

Many of the student participants in this program received a variety of specialized services, such as counseling, medical, educational, social, etc. In addition, the Pupil Personnel Teams made arrangements for placing students in specialized programs, such as the summer camping program.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Budget allocation: $49,500

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The primary method of evaluation of the Pupil Personnel Services Teams over the summer months consisted of observation and interviews. Because of the fact that the activities during the summer did not differ materially from those of the regular school year, it is almost impossible to separate out the effects of the summer activities.

b. Findings

The Pupil Personnel Services Teams were instrumental in organizing a number of summer activities and programs for the students.

The Teams were able in some instances to provide more concentrated help for students during the summer in a more relaxed and informal environment.

The summer months gave the Teams an opportunity to complete much necessary paperwork, as well as to re-evaluate their information and files about students in their caseload.

c. Conclusions

Many summer programs were greatly aided and supported by the Pupil Personnel Services Teams.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that this program be continued next summer. Suggested areas of emphasis are as follows:

- Following up of school dropouts.
- Assisting in referrals for clothing and other economic necessities to needy children.
- Random checking of activities of identified students over the summer months.
- Assisting Title I students in finding summer jobs.
- Maintaining contacts with administration of summer programs to assist with the problems affecting the educational development of identified students.

PROGRAM PLANNING (Secondary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was designed as a seminar workshop for staff members from Title I junior and senior high schools, who would be most directly involved in implementing Title I programs during the regular school year. Personnel from each school were to closely define Title I activities, identify children assigned to programs, work out scheduling of classes, and make plans for new Title I projects.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To have personnel who will be most directly involved in implementing the year-long Title I projects spend most of the summer planning and preparing for these projects.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The seminar was held from 6 July through 14 August at Stuart and Terrell Junior High Schools and Dunbar Senior High School.

b. Participants

Twenty-five staff members from the three schools participated in the workshop. There were no student participants.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

Staff from Stuart and Terrell developed a Building Trades Program for boys, to be implemented at the respective schools in the fall of 1970. The staff attended demonstrations and lectures conducted by representatives of the Kraus Development Industries Instructional Systems, Inc., and visited New York City to see this program in operation. Discussions were conducted to determine ways of improving English, reading, and math, through the building trades.

Staff from Dunbar High School developed plans for a remedial reading program to be implemented in the fall of 1970.

2) Student Activities

There were no students involved in this program.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Materials for the Building Trades Program were supplied by the Kraus Development Industries Instructional Systems, Inc.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

Better publicity about this program to Title I staff members could have resulted in larger enrollment for the workshop.

There was some difficulty in the beginning of the program as to the direction the program would follow, but as the seminar progressed, each school chose its own area for emphasis and study.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of teachers: 25
Budget allocation: $26,876

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

- Observation of the program by evaluation staff members, and interviews with the project director and administrator.

b. Findings

- There was strong interest in the Building Trades Program among staff members from Stuart and Terrell Junior High Schools. Since this was a new program not previously used in the school, the summer planning session was necessary to facilitate the implementation of this program in the fall.

- Staff members from Dunbar Senior High School were able to conduct an in-depth analysis and development of a special reading program.

c. Conclusions

This program was effective in providing staff members in Title I junior and senior high schools the opportunity to organize and develop Title I programs for the regular school year.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

This program should be evaluated during the regular school year to determine the achievement in the three new projects developed in the summer workshop.

AUDIOVISUAL SERVICES (Secondary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

This program was a workshop for Title I students in the sixth through the twelfth grades in the use of audiovisual materials. Students were supplied with equipment and materials and given training in the production of audiovisual instructional materials.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To provide students in Title I secondary schools an opportunity to produce both audiovisual instructional materials and enrichment materials. The students will therefore have a better understanding of audiovisual media and its use in our present society.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The workshop was conducted from 22 June through 31 July, with headquarters at the Twining Administration Building.

b. Participants

The workshop was open to all Title I students in grades six through twelve. A total of 35 students enrolled for the workshop. Students who were members of the school projectionist club during the regular school year were encouraged to participate in the summer workshop.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

- Participated in a week's orientation session before the beginning of the workshop.
- Instructed students in use of equipment.
- Directed students in the use of audiovisual materials for enrichment.

- Accompanied pupils on field trips.
- Made changes in the design of the program to meet the needs of students.
- Held review sessions for students who were absent.

2) Student Activities

Each student was supplied with a Kodak Instamatic camera and film. Field trips, on which students could take pictures, were conducted to the District Court, National Airport, Great Falls, the July Fourth celebration of the Mall, neighborhood sites of interest, and the Presidential Building.

Students also visited the other summer Title I programs and took photographs. Some of these photographs were used for brochures for one of the major departments of the D.C. School System.

Students in this program were able to enter the Kodak Teenage Movie Awards contest for 1970.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

All audiovisual equipment was housed at the Audiovisual Center. This included 8-mm., 16-mm., and 35-mm. cameras; tape recorders; and video tape recording materials.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

Except that the enrollment was not as great as anticipated, this program was free of any serious problems.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 35
Budget allocation: $10,000

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedure

The evaluation was a result of interviews and observation.

b. Findings

- Pupils were made sensitive to their own environment (main focus).
- An unusual degree of politeness and respect for each other was developed.
- Students were so enthusiastic about the program that few of them took advantage of the free lunch hour.
- There was a great deal of emphasis placed on reading and vocabulary development, especially terminology peculiar to audiovisual materials.
- The photographs taken by the students were of a quality that they were used professionally by a department of the D.C. Schools to illustrate brochures.

c. Conclusions

Students gained a general knowledge of all audiovisual materials and equipment selected for use in the program. This included thorough use of cameras of all types, projectors, tape recorders, video tape equipment, proper selection of films, etc.

Students will be able to assist teachers in the use of certain audiovisual equipment and materials as a result of this workshop.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

This program was of such merit that consideration should be given to expanding the program to reach teachers and more students in Title I schools.

Programs of this nature should be offered during the regular school year on Saturdays or after school.

AUDIOVISUAL CLUB (Elementary)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The Audiovisual Club provided Title I elementary-level students with the opportunity to learn the necessary skills and procedures in the production of pictorial and graphic art for school publications, as well as to prepare study displays and exhibits.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To teach students to produce pictorial and graphic art for school publications.
- To teach students to prepare study displays and exhibits.
- To indirectly provide students with the opportunity to learn about their environment and about resources within the community.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program was held at Blair-Ludlow-Taylor School for four weeks. Six Title I schools participated: Lewis, Goding, Wilson, Cook, Mott, and Madison.

b. Participants

A breakdown by schools of the 11 students who took part in this program is as follows:

Lewis	2	Cook	2
Goding	2	Madison	2
Wilson	2	Mott	1

These 11 students were: boys - 8; girls - 3.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The staff was given an in-service training course at the Media Center. Staff activities consisted of: directing and supervising students in working with audiovisual equipment, giving instruction in the preparation of displays and exhibits, and guiding trips to places of interest in the Washington area.

2) Student Activities

Students made use of various types of photographic equipment. They took and developed their own photographs, slides, and transparencies, and learned to arrange them for displays, exhibits, and published materials.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

Students worked with regular cameras, Polaroid cameras, film, transparencies, overhead projectors, and printing and reproduction equipment.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

- The time element involved in getting photographs developed, in relation to the length of time of the program, proved to be a problem.
- The lack of darkroom facilities was a major detriment to the effectiveness of the program.
- The complete success of the program was somewhat jeopardized by the late funding.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of students: 11
Budget allocation: $8,610

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

- Observation of the program.
- Interviews with the program director and administrators.

b. Findings

- The student interest was significantly high.
- A number of outside skills were developed incidentally as a direct result of the program activities; these skills included vocabulary, creative writing, and mathematics.

- Students were exposed to other summer programs as a result of taking pictures of these other Title I programs.

- The lack of darkroom facilities considerably raised the program expenses.

c. Conclusions

The program was successful in meeting its objectives, and the students were very enthusiastic about it.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

If the program is to be held again next summer, darkroom facilities should be made available to the students; more students should be involved in the program; and funding should be on time.

INNOVATION TEAM (Model School Division)

Summer 1970

1. DESCRIPTION

The Innovation Team provided supportive services for all programs within the Model School Division. These services provided direct instructional support for participants involved in the reading, mathematics, environmental, cultural enrichment, and community school programs.

2. OBJECTIVES

- To focus upon those techniques in instruction and classroom management that will improve summer programs.

3. IMPLEMENTATION

a. Duration of Program and Number of Schools

The program started on 15 June and continued through 1 July 1970. All schools in the Model School Division participated in the program.

b. Participants

Regular teachers in the Model School Division participated in this program.

c. Activities

1) Staff Activities

The Innovation Team had the major responsibility for planning and implementing the Model School Division summer programs. They arranged conferences, lectures, and consultant services for the program participants. In addition, they conducted an ongoing evaluation of the programs, as well as of their own services by receiving constant feedback from the program participants.

2) Student Activities

Students did not participate in this program directly.

d. Specialized Materials, Supplies, and Equipment

None.

e. Personnel and Logistical Problems

The major problem was that salary checks were not received on time, which tended to affect the morale of the members. Other problems arose due to lack of adequate space and an inefficient liaison with the Budget Office.

4. BUDGET FOR THE PROGRAM

Number of Team members:	10
Budget allocation:	$30,000

5. EVALUATION

a. Procedures

The main evaluation procedures for this program consisted of observation of the Team in action, and interviews with various Team members. The final evaluation lies in the performance to be evidenced by the participants in the Model School Division summer programs.

b. Findings

The enthusiasm of the Team members for the various programs was very evident to all who observed them, and proved to be infectious.

The planning and preparation of the Innovation Team for the Model School Division summer programs reflected study and thought.

c. Conclusions

The Innovation Team was successful in meeting its objectives.

The Innovation Team proved its ability to assure the smooth running of many programs, and to stimulate and maintain enthusiasm among the participants.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Budget allocations should be released earlier in the year, and salary checks should be issued on time.

APPENDIX

Guidelines for Consideration of Title I Programs

Forms:

- Administrator's Questionnaire
- Project READ Questionnaire
- Urban Journalism Questionnaire

GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF TITLE I PROGRAMS

1. Is this project designed to meet the needs of Title I children?
    a. What needs will be met?
    b. How will these needs be met?
    c. Are the needs to be met in line with what the City-Wide Committee has designated in its priority list of needs?
2. Will the proposed project supplement and not supplant, or take the place of, services already offered by the D.C. Public Schools?
3. How many children will be served by this project?
4. Where will the project be operated?
5. What types of staffing are involved in the project?
    a. Is this the most suitable way to staff this project?
    b. Do you have any suggestions as to better utilization of staffing?
6. Will the number of staff members requested in the proposal be adequate to carry out the goals of the project?
    a. Is it possible to find personnel to fill proposed positions?
    b. In line with item 5b above, could fewer staff members of a different type better carry out the goals of the project?
7. Is the per pupil cost reasonable?
8. Are the amounts and types of equipment and supplies requested in the proposal justifiable?
9. Will this program meet the accountability requirement?
10. Could this project be combined with another proposed project to the benefit of both projects?

NOTE: These Guidelines were used by the City-Wide Advisory Committee in deciding whether to approve or not approve programs to be recommended to the Superintendent for funding. The City-Wide Advisory Committee was composed of representatives from teachers, parents, and administrators from all parts of the Title I area.

Division of Planning, Innovation & Research
Public Schools of the District of Columbia

Title I Summer Programs: ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

ADMINISTRATOR'S NAME ______________________ DATE ____________

NAME OF PROGRAM ______________________ LOCATION ____________

DATES OF PROGRAM: from __________ to __________

1. Please give a brief description of your program. Tell what you are trying to accomplish, and how you are going about reaching your objectives. (Use back of page if necessary.)

Title I Summer Program: ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE - Continued

2. **What determined which students participated in the program? How were they selected or designated? State the number, respectively, of boys and girls in each grade level.**

Title I Summer Program: ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE - Continued

3a. What kinds of staff do you have? State the number in each category.

b. How did you select and train your staff?

4. What types of overall problems did you encounter in your program, and how were they resolved? Please explain briefly, listing specific examples.

Title I Summer Program: ADMINISTRATOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE - Continued

5. If this type of program were to be repeated, what changes would you recommend for improvement?

Title I Summer Program: ADMINISTRATOR'S QUESTIONNAIRE - Continued

6. Of the following Title I Program objectives, which do you think were achieved to a significant degree? Check as many as apply.

a. _______ improve reading skills
b. _______ improve mathematics skills
c. _______ improve speech and language abilities
d. _______ remedial instruction to attain grade level
e. _______ improve attitude toward school
f. _______ improve health and physical condition
g. _______ improve behavior
h. _______ improve economic status
i. _______ involve parents
j. _______ extend cultural horizons

---

7. Did you feel there were any unanticipated outcomes from this program? If so, please explain.

The George Washington University
Education Division, Social Research Group
June 1970

SUMMER PROJECT READ QUESTIONNAIRE

Name ______________________________ School ____________________

Program ___________________________________ Grade ______________

1. Please check the year(s) in which you used Project READ, and indicate the grade levels.

    ____ 1968-69 Grade(s) ________

    ____ 1969-70 Grade(s) ________

2. Were you given any previous training in the use of Project READ?

    ____ No

    ____ Yes, if so, please state what type of training you received.

    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____

3. Has this summer program been helpful to you?

    ____ No

    ____ Somewhat

    ____ Yes

    In what way has it been helpful? ________________
    ____
    ____
    ____

4. How could this summer program have been improved?

    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____
    ____

The George Washington University
Education Division, Social Research Group
July 1970

Urban Journalism Workshop
Summer 1970

Please fill in the spaces below. Please print your answers. Thank you.

Name ______________________ Birth date ____/____/____ (month/day/year)

School attended last year ______________________ Grade ________

1. How did you hear about the journalism workshop for this summer?

2. Have you had any previous training or experience in journalism? If so, explain.

3. What did you like best about the workshop this summer?

4. What did you like least about the workshop this summer?

5. Do you plan to continue in the journalism field after the workshop is completed? If yes, in what area?

6. What suggestions do you have for improving the workshop, if it is held next summer?

PLEASE USE THE BACK OF THIS PAGE
FOR ADDITIONAL COMMENTS.

GWU-024-3-70